

purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 10784. A bill to amend the Securities Exchange Act of 1934, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. YOUNG of Alaska (for himself, Mr. TOWELL of Nevada, Mr. FROELICH, Mr. BOB WILSON, and Mr. BAUMAN):

H.R. 10785. A bill to require that a percentage of U.S. oil imports be carried on U.S.-flag vessels; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ZWACH:

H.R. 10786. A bill to amend the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949 to provide for the use of excess property by certain grantees; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. ROONEY of Pennsylvania:

H.R. 10787. A bill to create a National Landlord and Tenant Commission, to establish housing courts, and to define or to provide therefor, the rights, obligations and liabilities of landlords and tenants so as to regulate the activities of the commercial rental housing operations which affect the stability of the economy, the amount of a person's real

income, the travel of goods and people in commerce, and the general welfare of all citizens of this Nation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. EILBERG:

H.J. Res. 754. Joint resolution establishing an independent commission to conduct a study of the Executive Office of the President and to make recommendations for reforms to increase cooperation between that Office and the Congress, to restore a balance of power between the executive and legislative branches of the Government, and to increase the accountability of the Executive Office of the President to the Congress and the public; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. FISH:

H. Con. Res. 331. Concurrent resolution calling for action by the United States with regard to the Schoenau processing center in Austria; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. HUBER (for himself and Mr. CLEVELAND):

H. Con. Res. 332. Concurrent resolution expressing the sense of Congress with respect to the missing in action in Southeast Asia; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. BIESTER:

H. Res. 579. A resolution to authorize the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to conduct an investigation and study of the 1973 pricing policies and profit margins of the major oil companies; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. ZION:

H. Res. 580. A resolution directing the Committee on the Judiciary to conduct an investigation into certain charges against Spiro T. Agnew; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

Mr. YOUNG of Illinois introduced a bill (H.R. 10788) for the relief of Walma T. Thompson, which was referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

307. The SPEAKER presented a petition of Atico A. Querijero, Baler, Quezon, Philippines, relative to redress of grievances; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

CONGRESSIONAL BUDGET REFORM OPPORTUNITIES AND PITFALLS

HON. FRANK E. MOSS

OF UTAH

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. MOSS. Mr. President, this week the Government Operations Committee is beginning consideration of S. 1541, the Federal Act To Control Expenditures and Establish National Priorities, with the intention of bringing legislation to the floor this month.

This is, therefore, an appropriate time for each of us to be expressing our concern over the need for improving the congressional budget process and over the pitfalls that could spell either an abortive attempt at reform or a system that is worse than the one that afflicts us today.

The distinguished Senator from Florida (Mr. CHILES), who has been an active participant in budget reform, recently spelled out his views in a speech before the Southern Governors' Conference. I believe his remarks are a valuable stimulus for thinking as this momentous legislation moves forward. I ask unanimous consent that his speech be printed in the Extensions of Remarks.

There being no objection, the speech was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

ADDRESS BY SENATORS LAWTON CHILES OF FLORIDA BEFORE THE 39TH ANNUAL MEETING OF THE SOUTHERN GOVERNORS' CONFERENCE

I think that most would agree that today we are going through a period of accelerated transition in every facet of our lives. One of the surest signals of that transition in government is the current movement to reform the federal budgeting process. The administration, through its attitudes and actions, has forced a mirror in front of the Congress, and we can not help but take a hard

look at ourselves and reassess our ability to hold up our end of the constitutional bargain. There are those who are quick to mention that in other times the Congress has looked away, not wanting to confront its own image or suffer the agonizing self-appraisal of its most dearly held traditions and procedures.

But these are not other times.

These are not other situations.

Not since the budgeting and accounting act of 1921 has there been so serious a movement to reconstitute federal budgeting. And nothing less will do because our out-dated budget habits are causing deadly serious repercussions.

First, they're building a burden of inflation that's breaking the back of every tax-paying citizen in this country. Every dollar of the \$70 billion deficit run up over the last 3 years is coming back to haunt us at the supermarket and hardware store.

Second, the current budget process has created the most serious strains in balance of constitutional powers that any of us has ever seen. As a means to the end of combating inflation, one man has sought to dictate which public needs are met, what monies are spent and which congressional appropriations are "inoperative."

And third—the subject that concerns us here today—the federal budget process is wreaking havoc with planning and programs—at the federal level, at the state level and at the local level.

Before discussing the status of Federal budget reform, I'd like to spend a moment to give you my impression of just how serious an impact Federal budgeting defects are having on the States.

Federal aid accounts for about one dollar in every five spent by State and local governments. As each State commits itself to plans and programs, hires people and lets contracts, however, 20% of the needed resources remain an unknown quantity. When financing will be available, for what programs and in what amounts have become unanswerable questions until well into the fiscal year. From the outset, States (and the Congress, too I might add) have no access to the formulation of the budget as it's orchestrated by the Office of Management and Budget. And after the budget is delivered to the Hill, Congress tries to digest the budget through

a ponderous series of authorizations and appropriations that still do nothing to clarify what the States can expect until well into the fiscal year. The delays leave the States between a hell of anxiety and a high water of frustration, not knowing how much will be forth-coming or when for highway construction, pollution control, health care, social services, and the gamut of categorical grant programs.

Nowhere is the damage more painful than in education. Last month, the Comptroller General reported that nearly 60% of the money authorized or planned to be spent under revenue sharing was to be directed toward education. And although I would have supported further general and special revenue sharing, Congress never had the chance to deal with any concrete proposals so that revenue sharing is a dying proposition. What we've got is all talk and no funding for 18 months. Meanwhile, Congress takes late action on impact aid, OMB holds up money, State plans for school construction and audio-visual equipment are left hanging and we're a month into the school year.

To sum up the situation as it now stands—in simple terms—the States of the Union are being discriminated against. Not only must they take a back seat in the Federal budget bus, but the bus is always late and you don't know where you're going until it's on its way. Each State has a vital vested interest in seeing effective budget reform enacted.

Enough on the problems. We all know them too well. What has to engage our energy now is solving them, taking inventory of how far we've progressed to date, and the prospects. In an overview sense, this is the way the reform efforts stand today:

No fewer than 67 Senators have either authored or co-sponsored budget reform legislation, some of which has been included in Senate bill 1541, the "Federal act to control expenditures and establish national priorities." The Senate government operations committee will begin hearing next month on this bill as well as those that have not yet been incorporated.

In the House, the rules committee has already begun hearings on H.R. 7130, the budget control act of 1973. This bill is largely a derivative of the report of the joint study committee on budget control issued just last

February. Both committees intend to report out reform legislation this year. This is an impressive track record by Congressional standards but there are several key issues that remain to be resolved:

(1) First: how will we cope with the power to be placed in new budget committees and which Members of Congress will exercise it.

(2) Second: how rigid and enforceable can Congressional spending ceilings be.

(3) Third: how do we carve up the budget to give a clear picture of national priorities, and

(4) How can long-term planning and program control be effected.

Because the Congress needs to replace a fragmented view of the budget with a centralized control of the total, all reforms embody the creation of a new budget committee in each House. Once and for all, the Congress would have one place to reconcile expenditures and revenues and to come to grips with a root source of inflation.

The new budget committees would be empowered to gain ascendancy over the Appropriations, Ways and Means, and Finance Committees, the key bodies which determine spending and revenues today, although independently. The Budget Committee would set limits not only to make total spending conform with revenues but also establish sublimits for each committee with jurisdiction to authorize expenditures.

You don't have to be a political scientist to know that these budget committees spell power—concentrated power—derived largely from the independent strength of other committees and their chairmen. To deter expected opposition, the early legislative proposals were for the budget committees to be dominated by members drawn from existing Appropriations, Ways and Means and Finance Committee membership.

But this arrangement causes concern:

(1) First there's the problem of liberals versus conservatives. Looking at the dominant conservative figures who might then move into Budget Committee power, there's some fear that perhaps social and domestic programs would fare better in the Nation's priorities if we just continued to let the White House exercise arbitrary impoundment.

(2) Second, there's the problem of young versus old Senators. If the seniority system that rewards longevity is compounded by still greater collected power on the Budget Committee, then younger Representatives could feel more frustrated in their hopes to affect the system.

(3) And third, there's the problem of the committee chairmen on the other legislative-authorizing committees. If their hands are going to be tied by how big a piece of pie the Budget Committee gives them then they're certainly going to want to be there and voting when it's carved up.

I believe the Senate, at least, has an opportunity to reach an acceptable compromise by permitting the party caucuses to determine who will serve on the new budget committees. When they are established, this scheme for composing the membership should be more advantageous to state interests by perhaps opening the Budget Committee to a more broadly-based set of sympathies and political ideologies.

The second controversial open issue concerns the rigidity of the spending limits imposed by the budget committee. At one extreme, the budget committee would only provide spending guide-lines. At the other extreme, budget committee totals and allocations would be voted into a concurrent resolution and subject to change only if off-setting adjustments were made in other spending and/or taxes were changed. On top of this the amendment would then have to gain as much as a two-thirds vote in the full house.

The legislation as it now stands tries to strike a delicate balance between the extremes so that budget limits are more than window dressing but not totally immune to necessary adjustments in the course of congressional review.

The budget committee resolution that sizes up the budget at the start would also have a "reserve fund" included. After all the committees review their programs and funding needs, a second resolution would be reported out to revise the first and allocate the general reserve. Floor amendments to raise funding could come on the second resolution but would have to include off-setting cuts or additional sources of revenue. Hopefully, the limits established by the first resolution plus the general reserve fund flexibility would prevent any major conflicts at the second go around.

As far as state financing is concerned, a system of budget limitations could actually increase opportunities for challenge, change and uncertainty, all of which could delay timely financing of state and local programs. In fact, the 57-page bill now in the Senate is largely devoted to a complex set of procedures to accommodate changes within and between the two Houses, changing committee allocations and making off-setting adjustments.

To my mind, this second issue—rigid budget allocations—is really moot unless the third is resolved: How to set budget categories. This is one that concerns me personally.

If the Congress and, through Congress, the people are to have a chance to control national priorities then how subcategories are defined is crucial.

Priorities are not controlled by pouring money into one congressional committee or another. Their jurisdictions overlap and several oversee programs devoted to identical public needs in the same State.

Nor do we control priorities by pouring money into one agency's account or another, especially when the President's budget as presented "force-fits" programs and agencies into arbitrary categories.

Let me give you some figures to demonstrate the confusion over who's doing what with which funds. The average standing committee in the Senate has full or partial jurisdiction over more than three executive departments or independent agencies based only on those agencies that were mentioned in the proposed 1970 reorganization plan. (I tried to match committee jurisdiction against each and every agency but was informed by the congressional experts that this had never been done and would probably take ten man-years to do.) At any rate, you might be able to keep in mind that a budget allocation going to one committee was in fact for three separate agencies. But then the agencies' programs are uncoordinated. Based on the President's budget submission, seven separate agencies have programs to support national needs for community development and housing; twelve have programs for natural resources and environment; and twenty-one separate and independent agencies are funded to carry out programs to meet education and manpower needs.

Unless and until the Federal Government's programs are collected into sensible groupings and budget limits applied to these, we may gain some control over much we're spending but no control over what we're buying.

Finally, forward-looking long-term planning is a prerequisite. State and Federal programs don't spring full-blown in a single fiscal year. They require years of care and feeding if they are to be effective and progress through planning, testing, and operation. The front-end planning stage is crucially important because this is where the

future funding requirement—where the "turkeys"—are born. Only 5% of the total program cost may be involved, and may seem harmless enough but the fact is the foot is in the door.

One of the symptoms of Federal budget gluttony is starting more programs than we can reasonably expect to finish within limited resources. Later, State and local recipients of Federal aid find themselves left out in the cold and each of us is taken to task for the inexcusable gap between promise and performance. These last two issues—controlling outlays on the basis of a clear pattern of national needs and controlling programs throughout their long-term life-cycle—are essential ingredients if reform is to be effective at State and Federal levels. I originally set them down in S. 1414, a bill which I introduced earlier this year and which I am hopeful will become a part of the Senate budget package.

As you can surmise from this brief account of only four outstanding issues, it's impossible to predict exactly when the Federal budget process will be overhauled or exactly what form it will ultimately take. At this stage, Jimmy the Greek could probably provide as much insight as anyone. But because reform is still in a formative period, now is the time for the States to make their views known, to push for the specific provisions I've mentioned in order to make the process accessible and compatible with your needs.

The stakes are high. We have the opportunity to abolish a system that says, in effect, the taxpayer be damned: He either bleeds through taxes to finance uncontrolled Federal spending or, without higher taxes, he bleeds more through inflation. It really doesn't matter whether the "budget busters" are down town at the White House or up on Capitol Hill. Self-serving accusations don't help control inflation or get money to State programs in a timely fashion.

We have the opportunity to create a system that both illuminates and straightens the dark labyrinth of the Federal budget process, to create a system that gives everyone a clear picture of where their money is going—for what needs—and who wants it spent where.

Congressional reform—self initiated and serious—is proceeding not just in the budget process but also in campaign financing, the tax system and other equally fundamental areas. This discernable movement represents one of the most hopeful and refreshing signs that the system remains a dynamic, living, breathing body capable of responding to the needs of the American people.

But this is no miracle. Americans will not long abide with a feeling of malaise and paralysis. They would sooner turn their backs on politics and politicians in general. I know that; you know that; and every Member of Congress knows that. And that's exactly why the system is responding.

Crisis is and always has been a catalyst for democracy. Make no mistake, Watergate and all it symbolizes represents a crisis of enduring proportions. But far from wallowing in Watergate, we are capitalizing on it.

I ran across a statement that I thought would be an appropriate conclusion, in part because it was made by one of Governor Holton's predecessors, a former Governor of Virginia. He said:

"I am not an advocate for frequent and untried changes in laws and constitutions . . . but I know also that . . . as new discoveries are made, new truths disclosed . . . institutions must advance also, and keep pace with the time."

The speaker was Thomas Jefferson. The country has had a full dose of newly disclosed truths—many unpleasant—that won't be soon forgotten. But the business we're all into right now is making our institutions keep pace with the times.

PUBLIC OPINION QUESTIONNAIRES

HON. DAVID TOWELL

OF NEVADA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. TOWELL of Nevada. Mr. Speaker, every year more and more Members of the House are making use of public opinion questionnaires mailed to every mail box in their districts. Little, however, has been done to coordinate this effort or to prepare joint tables of the responses for the guidance of all concerned.

As a step forward in this regard, I call attention to a joint opinion poll report prepared by Dr. W. P. Cortelyou, a public opinion consultant, during the August recess. Dr. Cortelyou is well known in my office and in many other congressional offices for his expertise in the computerized analysis of opinion results.

He is not new to this field. His first recommendations in congressional polling were inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on June 26, 1942, by Representative Charles Halleck, who will long be remembered for his leadership of the Republican Party.

This report summarizes the findings of nearly 50 Congressmen with reference to the 20 most popular questions used in recent questionnaires. This means that some 15-million adults were given the opportunity to respond to two or more of these questions. More than 1.2-million people did respond.

Dr. Cortelyou is president of Epoch—Everyman's Public Opinion Clearing House—a new, nonprofit, tax-exempt corporation. One of its purposes is to improve congressional opinion polling and to urge the use of similar techniques by many kinds of citizen groups. Participation is limited to congressional staff members.

TWENTY POPULAR QUESTIONS

To save space and simplify the comparisons, only the "Yes" percentages are included in this table. The topics are listed in alphabetical order in succeeding columns. After each topic is a representative wording of the question. The actual wording was a bit different in most cases. This seemed to have only a small effect, but some published responses to similar questions were not included in the table because it appeared that the Congressman was trying to generate a response in agreement with his own views or he was asking a legitimate question, but one that appeared to measure something quite different from that measured by the question listed in the table.

Each question is followed by a data line which gives: First, the mean of the "Yes" percentages, second, their standard deviation—SD—and third, their interquartile range—IQR. A small SD or IQR means high agreement across the country.

Then we find an entry for each office reporting responses to the question. Each entry gives: First, the "Yes" percentage, second, the Congressman's party, third, the principal city, county or area, fourth,

the State, and fifth, the district number. The entries are listed in the order of increasing "Yes" percentages. The median—middle—value—or the average of the two middle values—is included between the two solid lines. The IQR data—middle half of the values—are included between two dotted lines. The IQR is the difference between the highest and lowest of these values. For instance, under abortion we see that IQR=65—41=24.

The five districts that appear within the IQR most often are marked thus: MI*8, TX*10, CA*41, PA*8, and NY*25. These five districts are apparently more typical of the whole Nation than the others are.

The tables follow:

Abortion: Agree with the Supreme Court decision?

Mean=54	SD=14	IQR=24
31 R Grand Rapids	MI	15
37 R Appleton	WI	8
40 R Western	SD	2
41 R Bethesda	MD	8
47 R Winston Salem	NC	8
52 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2

55 (Median)		
59 R Bucks County	PA*	8
64 D El Paso	TX	16
65 R All of	NV	

67 R Eastern	NJ	6
71 R Moline	IL	19
73 R Columbus	OH	15

Abortion: Prohibit. Amend the Constitution if necessary?

Mean=23	SD=12	IQR=10
11 R Bethesda	MD	8
14 R Bucks County	PA*	8
20 R Columbus	OH	15

22 (Median)		
24 R Eastern	NJ	6
29 R Nassau County	NY	4
45 R Grand Rapids	MI	15

Amnesty: Grant unconditional amnesty to those who evaded the draft?

Mean=16	SD=7	IQR=7
6 R El Paso	TX	16
8 R Atlanta	GA	4
8 R Dallas	TX	3
9 R Memphis	TN	8
10 R Grand Rapids	MI	15
10 R Dallas	TX	5

12 R Montgomery	AL	2
12 D San Diego	CA*	41
12 R Bucks County	PA*	8
12 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
13 R Riverside	IL	3
15 R Houston	TX	7

16 R Waukegan	IL	13
17 D Western	NC	11
17 R Portland	OR	1
18 R Winston Salem	NC	5
18 R Columbus	OH	12
19 R Nassau County	NY	4
19 D Los Angeles	CA	30

20 R Manchester	NH	1
21 R Northwest	CA	1
26 R Columbus	OH	15
29 R Kokomo	IN	5
29 R Boulder	CO	2
31 R Western	SD	2

Amnesty: Grant amnesty to the draft evaders if they render equivalent public service?

Mean=32	SD=11	IQR=10
15 R Chattanooga	TN	3
17 D El Paso	TX	16
20 R Lenoir	NC	10
23 R Dallas	TX	3
27 R Memphis	TN	8
28 R All of	NV	
28 R Portland	OR	1
31 D Los Angeles	CA	30
31 D San Diego	CA*	41

32 (Median)		
33 R Atlanta	GA	4
33 R Saginaw	MI*	8
37 R Grand Rapids	MI	80
37 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
37 R Northwest	CO	4

39 R Appleton	WI	8
44 R Bucks County	PA*	8
47 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
58 R Columbus	OH	15

Auto insurance: Establish nationwide no-fault auto insurance?

Mean=66	SD=5	IQR=4
60 R Moline	IL	19
62 D Austin	TX	10
63 D Los Angeles	CA	30

64 (Median)		
66 R Joliet	IL	17
70 R Lenoir	NC	10
76 R Riverside	IL	3

Busing: Amend Constitution. Prohibit busing for racial balance?

Mean=77	SD=5	IQR=2
74 R Waukegan	IL	13
75 R All of	NV	
76 R Northwestern	CA	1
76 R Joliet	IL	17

77 (Median)		
78 R Charlotte	NC	9
78 D Columbus	IN	9
80 D El Paso	TX	16
90 R Jeffersontown	KY	4

Day Care Centers: Continue federal funds for them?

Mean=46	SD=11	IQR=17
31 R Saginaw	MI*	8
34 R Joliet	IL	17
39 D El Paso	TX	16
45 D Austin	TX	10
56 R Bethesda	MD	8

60 R Princeton	NJ	5
60 R Salisbury	NC	8
60 R Princeton	NJ	5
80 R Waukegan	IL	13

Death penalty: Restore it for the worst crimes?

Mean=83	SD=10	IQR=7
53 R Grand Rapids	MI	15
67 R Kokomo	IL	5
70 R Boulder	CO	2
72 R Manchester	NH	1
72 R Princeton	NJ	5
80 R Waukegan	IL	13

82 R Bucks County	PA*	8
83 R Moline	IL	19
83 R Houston	TX	7
84 R St. Joe	MI	4
84 R Saginaw	MI*	8
85 R Columbus	OH	12

86 R Salisbury	NC	8
86 R Chattanooga	TN	3
88 R Joliet	IL	17
88 R Northwestern	AK	3

89 R Winston Salem	NC	5
89 R Lenoir	NC	10
89 D Western	NC	11
90 R Montgomery	AL	2
91 R Jeffersonton	KY	4
91 R Dallas	TX	5
98 R Dallas	TX	3

Food stamps: Make them available to strikers?

Mean=18	SD=7	IQR=3
5 R Atlanta	GA	4
14 R Northwestern	CO	4
16 R Western	SD	2
18 R Princeton	NJ	5

18 (Median)		
19 R Chattanooga	TN	3
19 R Saginaw	MI*	8

26 R All of	NV	
29 R Appleton	WI	8

Guns: Control the "Saturday Night Specials"?

Mean=58	SD=18	IQR=20
29 R Dallas	TX	5
31 R Atlanta	GA	4

47 R Moline	IL	19
52 R All of	NV	
65 R Montgomery	AL	2

67 R Appleton	WI	8
67 R Northwestern	AK	3

80 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
83 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29

Health insurance: Establish some sort of federal program?

Mean=51	SD=9	IQR=11
39 R Portland	OR	1
43 R Columbus	OH	15
44 R Western	SD	2

47 R Manchester	NH	1
47 R Saginaw	MI*	8
49 D Austin	TX*	10

51 R Appleton	WI	8
---------------	----	---

52 R Northwestern	CO	4
54 R Memphis	TN	8
58 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2

60 R All of	NV	
64 D Los Angeles	CA	30
65 R Boulder	CO	2

Highway fund: Use some of it to develop mass transit?

Mean=52	SD=14	IQR=17
16 D El Paso	TX	16
29 R St. Joe.	MI	4
38 R Moline	IL	19
43 D Columbus	IN	9
44 R Appleton	WI	8

46 D Western	NC	11
48 R Waukegan	IL	13
49 R Jeffersonton	KY	4
50 R Memphis	TN	8
50 R Dallas	TX	5
53 R All of	NV	

56 R Lenoir	NC	10
-------------	----	----

58 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
59 D San Diego	CA*	41
60 R Kokomo	IN	5
61 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29
63 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2

64 R Rochester	NY	35
65 R Niagara Falls	NY	36
69 R Columbus	OH	15
73 R Princeton	NJ	5
74 R Riverside	IL	3
75 R Bethesda	MD	8

OEO: Continue federal funds for it?

Mean=31	SD=7	IQR=11
20 R Atlanta	GA	4
20 R Dallas	TX	3
25 R Saginaw	MI*	8
31 R Rochester	NY	35

32 R Columbus	OH	15
33 R Oyster Bay	NY	3
36 R Northwestern	AK	3

37 R All of	NV	
43 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2

Postal Service: Return it to the control of Congress?

Mean=50	IQR=14
42 R Princeton	NJ 5
43 R Houston	TX 7

50 (Median)		
-------------	--	--

57 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29
-----------------------	----	----

60 D El Paso	TX	16
--------------	----	----

Parochial schools: Give parents income tax credit for part of tuition?

Mean=43	SD=11	IQR=14
32 D El Paso	TX	16
36 R Winston Salem	NC	5
36 R Atlanta	GA	4
38 R Oyster Bay	NY	3

38 R Austin	TX*	10
39 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29
39 D San Diego	CA*	41
42 D Los Angeles	CA	30

42 (Median)		
-------------	--	--

43 D Western	NC	11
48 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
48 R Grand Rapids	MI	15
52 R Columbus	OH	12

55 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
57 R Salisbury	NC	8
67 R Memphis	TN	8
69 R Montgomery	AL	2

Press: Guarantee to reporters the right to confidential sources?

Mean=57	SD=10	IQR=11
36 R Manchester	NH	1
42 R Lenoir	NC	10
46 R Charlotte	NC	9
48 R Memphis	TN	8
50 R Riverside	IL	3

50 R Western	SD	2
51 R Columbus	OH	12
52 R Niagara Falls	NY	36
52 R Montgomery	AL	2
53 R Nassau County	NY	4
55 R Grand Rapids	MI	15

57 R Princeton	NJ	5
58 R Boulder	CO	2
60 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
61 R Saginaw	MI*	8
61 D San Diego	CA*	41

64 R Portland	OR	1
67 R All of	NV	
68 R Kokomo	IN	5
70 D Los Angeles	CA	30
71 D Dallas	TX	3
76 D Western	NC	11

President: Forbid him to impound funds appropriated by Congress?

Mean=47	SD=14	IQR=25
23 R Winston Salem	NC	5
28 R Montgomery	AL	2
29 R Eastern	NJ	6
31 R Rochester	NY	35

33 R Bucks County	PA*	8
33 R Saginaw	MI*	8
35 R Appleton	WI	8
43 D Columbus	IN	9

49 R Lenoir	NC	10
50 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25

50 (Median)		
-------------	--	--

50 R Joliet	IL	17
52 R Princeton	NJ	5
56 D Austin	TX	10
57 R Salisbury	NC	8
58 R Portland	OR	1

60 D San Diego	CA*	41
63 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
63 D El Paso	TX	16
63 D Los Angeles	CA	30
66 R Bethesda	MD	8

President: Reduce his war-making powers?

Mean=71	SD=10	IQR=7
51 D El Paso	TX	16
59 R Portland	OR	1
66 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29

69 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
72 R Bucks County	PA*	8
72 R Lenoir	NC	10

72 (Median)		
-------------	--	--

72 R Boulder	CO	2
74 D Los Angeles	CA	30
76 R Saginaw	MI*	8

76 R Moline	IL	19
76 R Northwestern	CO	4
92 D Western	NC	11

Vietnam, North: Help them rebuild?

Mean=11	SD=5	IQR=5
3 R Dallas	TX	5
3 D El Paso	TX	16
6 D Western	NC	11
6 R Chattanooga	TN	3
7 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
7 R All of	NV	
7 R St. Joe.	MI	4

8 R Saginaw	MI*	8
8 R Atlanta	GA	4
8 R Northwest	CO	4
9 R Dallas	TX	3
9 R Eastern	NJ	6
10 R Montgomery	AL	2

10 R Boulder	CO	4
--------------	----	---

11 R Northwestern	CA	1
11 R Riverside	IL	3
11 R Winston Salem	NC	5
11 D San Diego	CA*	41
12 R Memphis	TN	8
13 R Oyster Bay	NY	3
13 R Saratoga Springs	NY	29

14 R Joliet	IL	17
15 R Waukegan	IL	13
18 R Poughkeepsie	NY*	25
19 R Kokomo	IN	5
21 D Columbus	IN	9
22 R Nassau County	NY	4

Vietnam, South: Help them rebuild?

Mean=24	SD=11	IQR=12
12 R All of	NV	

16 D Chicago, S. Side	IL	2
-----------------------	----	---

22 D San Diego	CA*	41
----------------	-----	----

28 R Eastern	NJ	6
--------------	----	---

42 R Riverside	IL	3
----------------	----	---

IT IS REALLY STRANGE

HON. JOHN M. ZWACH

OF MINNESOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. ZWACH. Mr. Speaker, for the first time in over 20 years producers do not

have their price structures threatened by huge Government grain surpluses which could be manipulated to hold prices down.

Those Government surpluses disappeared as a result of our grain deal with Russia, but a lot of people, rather than applauding that transaction that resulted in higher prices for our producers, are complaining, because we no longer have a price-busting surplus.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to insert into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, for the information of my colleagues, a recent newspaper column by Margery Burns on this subject.

Mrs. Burns, a rural housewife, writes a widely read column which appears in many of our Sixth Congressional District newspapers.

The article follows:

IT IS REALLY STRANGE

A strange and unbelievable phenomenon has hit too many farmers and rural businessmen these last few months.

Can you imagine these good folks groaning because, for the first time in 20 years, they are getting good prices for what they sell? Can you imagine them moaning because they might keep on getting good prices? Can you imagine them grousing because they have a chance to sell more of their merchandise and machinery than they have for years? Can you imagine them weeping because they will be having a better living in the next years?

Here we are, with farm prices the highest they've been for over 20 years, and some farmers and small businessmen are having a fit. They actually are jumping all over the government for selling all that grain to Russia. Now, it is true that the farmers didn't make a killing off that sale, but they stand to make a good living this year because of that sale to Russia.

Do you remember back in the 1960's when we had so much grain it was coming out of our ears? And you remember, during those years, whenever the price of corn started to go up even a few cents, the government dumped millions of bushels of corn on the market and kept the price down at a neat, low figure!

So, now what happens? We don't have those millions of bushels of grain hanging over our heads to depress the market, and for the first time in years, the price of grain is at a reasonable level.

But do you hear all the farmers shouting with happiness? Do you hear every farm machinery dealer singing with glee? Do you hear all the merchants in the rural towns clapping their hands in delight?

Now, when there's a real chance for farmers to make a few dollars which in turn will help every rural town in the country, you still hear that strange griping about getting rid of all the surplus grain that's been hanging over our heads for too many years. And you even hear talk from politicians about building up another big surplus of grain, and you know what that will do to farm prices again.

What will happen to farmers and small towns if the price of farm products is forced down again while farm expenses stay sky high? You can guess... millions more farmers will have to leave their farms and the small towns will suffer. And who will run the farms then? The big conglomerates who will insist on high farm prices and who won't care about the people in the rural towns.

So, can you imagine any farmer or small businessman complaining even once about the lack of a big surplus of grain and about the reasonable prices for farm products? And yet that's what's happening.

It's a strange and unbelievable phenomenon.

REAFFIRMATION OF SOUNDNESS OF FINANCIAL SECTIONS OF H.R. 9682

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, recently you received a letter from a citizen of the District of Columbia, Mr. C. N. Mason, criticizing some of the financial aspects of H.R. 9682, the D.C. Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act. Unfortunately, Mr. Mason's letter, copies of which went to every Member, was inaccurate as to the effect of some important provisions in this bill. I am, therefore, submitting for your review a copy of my reply to Mr. Mason responding to and correcting many of his concerns. I trust this will reinforce in the minds of many Members the extensive work, thought, and effort that went into making the financial sections of H.R. 9682 sound and acceptable provisions:

U.S. HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

Washington, D.C., October 4, 1973.

Mr. C. N. MASON,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. MASON: Thank you for forwarding to our attention your recent letter to Speaker of the House, The Honorable Carl Albert, regarding the financial provisions of H.R. 9682, the D.C. Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act. We appreciate the scrutiny which you, as a citizen of the District, have given to this important legislation affecting all citizens of this city. It is unfortunate, however, that you have been confused and incorrectly assessed a number of the financial provisions of the bill.

First, I would like to stress that each of the financial sections of this bill have been worked out in close consultation with the General Accounting Office, the Executive Office of Management and Budget, and the Assistant to the Mayor for Financial Management. The provisions in H.R. 9682 will result in improved procedures and in timely, accurate financial information available to the Mayor, the Council, the Congress and the general public.

Second, to respond to your particular concern about the basis of the District budget and the use of an obligation or expenditure accounting process, let me indicate that the wording of Sections 442 through 446 and Section 603 provide that the District of Columbia will operate on a program budgeting basis using both obligations and outlays. This is the system currently in use in many Federal agencies and we believe is consistent with the combined state-county-municipal functions of the District of Columbia. Both obligation and outlay data is utilized currently in the city's budget, prepared and submitted to the Congressional Appropriations Committees, and would be continued.

Contrary to your statement in your letter to the Speaker, the bill clearly recognizes the two separate budget functions of financing expenditures and controlling the incurring of obligations. For this very reason, Section 448 specifically sets forth the responsibilities of the Mayor for financing the budget, while Section 450 sets forth the specific responsibilities of the Mayor for controlling the incurring of obligations and liabilities. We would concur with your concern over the use of the word "expenditures" in Section 446 and have already prepared an amendment to correct this.

Third, you have unfortunately failed to understand the important procedures provided for handling the Federal payment in Sections 501 and 503. To help clarify your

understanding of these provisions, the Executive Branch would not be required to act on the Federal payment prior to receiving relevant budget information. Quite the contrary, the OMB would, per the explicit language of Section 502, receive full and complete information to assess the city's Federal payment request. Currently, OMB receives the city's Federal payment request in late October while the city does not release its budget until mid-January. Under H.R. 9682, the payment would go to OMB by December 1, in time for inclusion in the President's budget request to Congress and at the same time as the city is finalizing its budget for mid-January. Thus, the process of revising the payment and the budget will be conducted simultaneously. The "other elements" to be used by the Mayor and Congress in determining the payment level should, in the judgment of this Committee, be determined by the Mayor and members of the Appropriations Committees directly. The Congress, in reviewing the Federal payment, may continue to use whatever materials it deems necessary, including but not limited to materials used by the Council. We have further been advised that the language of Sections 502 and 503 are sufficient to authorize supplemental requests.

Fourth, in response to some of your general concerns, we have conferred with GAO staff who believe the language of the bill does permit GAO access to all D.C. Auditor reports. The titles of Sections 449 and 603 do not, in any way, affect their legal interpretation.

Let me conclude by reaffirming that over nine months of intensive work has been devoted to this legislation, including numerous hearings, working sessions and markups with ample opportunity provided for public input. For over 100 years the citizens of the District of Columbia have waited for self-determination. It is now the time to provide this basic democratic principle.

Sincerely,

CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.,
Chairman, Committee on the
District of Columbia.

INCREASE IN SOCIAL SECURITY

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, the Senate passed and sent to the House a bill, S. 1866, with an amendment providing for the recently enacted 5.6 percent social security increase to take effect in the month of enactment of the bill, rather than June of 1974 as originally intended. It has now been 3 weeks, and the House has yet to even consider this vital legislation.

The plight of our older Americans who must depend largely on social security for daily income, remains one of the great tragedies of our time. With the steady bombardment of unfavorable economic statistics from the Cost of Living Council and others, the daily economic survival of these Americans becomes precarious. We in Congress have before us legislation which can at least provide some relief for these beleaguered individuals, yet it sits dormant.

The House has shown its ability to assist other groups in their attempts to combat the rising cost of living. An ex-

ample are the Federal retirees, who received a 6-percent increase in pension payments automatically last July, and will receive another increase, in excess of that, in January.

Mr. Speaker, these older Americans on social security are not looking for handouts. They have worked many long hours and contributed faithfully to insure that their elderly years would be comfortable. Yet now, many of these same individuals are at the brink of poverty because of an inability to keep pace with inflation. Let us in Congress demonstrate to these Americans that their welfare is our foremost concern. We can begin to show this by taking immediate action on S. 1866. Every day we delay will only mean further suffering for our older citizens.

I sincerely hope this increase in social security payments will be advanced to immediate payment thereby easing the economic squeeze our older citizens find themselves. If it is right for June, it is more humane to pay it now.

COLUMBUS DAY

HON. J. HERBERT BURKE

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BURKE of Florida. Mr. Speaker, under the Monday holiday law presently in effect only three men are singled out for holidays in their honor—George Washington, Abraham Lincoln, and Christopher Columbus.

Both George Washington and Abraham Lincoln were wartime Presidents of the United States and national heroes. However, Christopher Columbus is more than a national hero, he is an international hero. His deeds and courage are celebrated not only by the United States, but by all countries in the Western Hemisphere, and by many countries in Europe—notably Italy and Spain—and, indeed, by all citizens of the world.

George Washington and Abraham Lincoln changed the course of the United States, but Christopher Columbus changed the course of the world.

It is hard to imagine the courage and daring of this man who chose to test conventional wisdom against his own beliefs. His quest for truth and knowledge stands out as the turning point in Western history and, indeed, in world history.

What does Christopher Columbus mean to men of the 20th century?

He is a man who fought tenaciously and suffered terribly, because he wanted to find the truth and make it triumph.

His audacious ideas and great enterprise corrected a wrong conception of the structure of the universe for all mankind.

He roused the world. He stirred it up, and he launched it toward a new destiny.

Columbus is a great example to us today. A great light that permits us to understand our world better, and our people wrought by doubts, tolling to seek

the truth, who are supported and consoled by faith in fundamental human values.

As we face new worlds of space, new worlds of scientific discovery, and new worlds of human relationships, his example will give us heart to look further into the unknown.

SOCIAL SECURITY TAXES

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, I have noted recently that the Nixon administration is considering a program to lower social security taxes for the working poor as part of its welfare reform program.

This is just another example of how the adage applies—"Give them time but sooner or later we can drag the Republican Party into the 20th century."

It would seem wise to me for the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare to draw this program out of the consideration category and give it some honest priority treatment.

The administration "considers" such programs on the basis of how they will affect line items in a budget. The working poor paying the tax "consider" it on a more frequent interval—every time they are paid.

The views of HEW Secretary Caspar Weinberger on the subject were contained in a Washington Post article of October 3. I offer it for your perusal at this time.

HEW SUGGESTS LOWER TAX ON SOCIAL SECURITY FOR POOR
(By Peter Millus)

Health, Education and Welfare Secretary Caspar W. Weinberger has suggested a lowering of Social Security taxes for the working poor as one possible means of achieving "welfare reform."

The suggestion was made in virtually unnoticed testimony a week ago before the Senate Finance Committee.

President Nixon has asked Weinberger to come up with some fresh approaches to welfare reform. The administration made one reform proposal in 1969. It remained an issue before the Congress for most of Mr. Nixon's first term, but no bill was ever passed.

Weinberger told the Finance Committee last week that the Social Security tax is "a significant payment for low-wage earners." The tax has gone up sharply in recent years—most recently last January—and Weinberger said that this year, for the first time, "more than half the nation's taxpayers will pay more Social Security tax than federal income tax."

The Social Security tax is now the same for all wage-earners—5.85 per cent on the first \$12,600 of income.

Critics point out that it takes a larger percentage of a poor man's income than of a rich man's. Some would like to see it made progressive, the rate rising with income as the income tax rates do.

Weinberger's testimony was on a "work bonus" idea before the committee that would also have the effect of lowering net tax burdens on the working poor.

"We see alternative techniques which may be preferable," he said. "In general terms, an alternative might be to reduce or eliminate

withholding of the (Social Security) tax for a family with an income below" some agreed-upon level. "As income rises above this level, withholding would gradually phase in."

He was no more specific in his testimony, and aides said yesterday that this was only one of many approaches being explored.

One of the problems in welfare reform is that so many existing federal programs are intended to aid the poor—tax reductions, direct federal payouts, special subsidies for food and housing. Some authorities favor consolidating as many of these as possible into a single program, a kind of merger of the tax and welfare systems. Weinberger's suggestion leans in that direction.

HERMAN STRAHL—WHY AMERICA NEEDS IMMIGRANTS

HON. E. G. SHUSTER

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. SHUSTER. Mr. Speaker, much has been said recently, pro and con, about tying our trade policy with Russia to the Soviet's immigration policy. A good case can be made for keeping our trade policy separate from our human values. After all, it can be argued, we should not impose our values relating to human freedom on foreign countries.

We should trade with foreign countries based on our economic self-interest. If Russia wants to buy products we have to sell, the transaction should be based on an economic decision. But in a larger sense, I believe an even better case can be made for basing such decisions on a higher value. That is, a human value based on freedom. In the abstract, I believe it can be said that the American destiny demands that we place human values above economic values. Indeed, that we use economic values to promote human values. And conversely, that we not sacrifice human values to promote economic values.

This abstraction takes on more meaning if we see it in specific human terms.

Let me share with you an example which, I believe, can be multiplied with minor variation, hundreds of times over in America.

Shortly after the turn of the century, the czarist Russians drove many Jewish families out of Russia. One little boy, who came to be known eventually as Herman Strahl, walked across Europe with his father and embarked in steerage for America. Eventually the rest of the family joined them and they settled in the ghetto section of Pittsburgh, Pa. The young boy literally fought with his fists to maintain his newspaper stand on the streets of Pittsburgh; he quit school to work as an office boy for the P. & L. E. Railroad because his family needed the money, and he later went to night school so he could make something of himself.

This Jewish immigrant from Russia, this boy who owned nothing more than the promise of opportunity in a free land did indeed make something of himself. As the years went by, he rose through the ranks of the P. & L. E. Railroad to eventually become the auditor of

revenue—a top accounting job—in an industry which then had no room for Jews, let alone Jewish immigrants. Herman Strahl, and hundreds of others like him, have made America a better land to live in.

If we, today, do not use our economic strength to encourage free immigration of citizens from Russia and all foreign lands, to the countries of their choice, we will be choking off one of the sources of vitality and renewal for our country, and other lands as well.

Mr. Speaker, I want this Congress to see that the Herman Strahls of this century have given much more to America than they have received, or even expected to receive. I want this Congress to see that it is in our own enlightened self-interest to work toward a more open immigration policy throughout this world.

I urge this Congress to vote for an international trade policy with Russia, and other nations, which clearly says that human values are even more important than economic values to the people of America today.

EXEMPTION FERTILIZER STABILIZATION ACT

HON. JERRY LITTON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. LITTON. Mr. Speaker, today I introduced a bill which would exempt fertilizer from the Economic Stabilization Act. Under phase IV fertilizer prices are frozen well below the world market price. Because of this we are exporting unprecedented quantities of fertilizer to countries throughout the world, including Red China, while thousands of American farmers cannot buy fertilizer at any price.

This irresponsible action from an inflexible Cost of Living Council who knows little about farming is going to create unnecessary food shortages in this country next year which will be translated into higher food prices to the consumer.

The Cost of Living Council is creating another Russian wheat deal situation of greater magnitude than that which involved the sale of about 12 million tons of wheat to Russia last year. Conservative USDA data already forecasts a shortage of about 4 million tons of fertilizer material which represents a loss of about 20 million tons of grain next year, or nearly twice as much as was sold to Russia in the wheat deal last year.

On September 7, I called on President Nixon to lift the freeze on fertilizer prices and urged the House Agriculture Committee to conduct hearings on the matter. The Department Operations Subcommittee is now in the midst of the second week of these hearings. Because of the apparent lack of concern for expediency by the Cost of Living Council as exhibited by their testimony at the hearings and because of their past track record, I felt obliged to offer this bill. We were promised that a mandatory allocation program for propane and heat-

ing oil would be announced in just a few days for 4 months and it took a bill from Congress to get the administration to announce such a program. Maybe the bill I have offered will have the same effect.

When I urged President Nixon on September 7 to lift fertilizer from phase IV, I pointed out that if the grain that will not be produced in America next year because of the fertilizer shortage were all wheat, it would represent nearly 50 billion loaves of bread, which is almost a 5-year supply of bread for the entire population of the United States. I understand Secretary of Agriculture Butz on September 19 also came out in favor of lifting the freeze on fertilizer prices.

The 4 million tons of fertilizer represented in the shortage will cost American farmers about \$500 million at the world market price and this will produce an extra 20 million tons of grain worth approximately \$2 billion.

It is poor arithmetic to say that lifting the freeze on fertilizer is inflationary in that the fertilizer would cause considerably more grain to be produced which would substantially lower the price of food to the consumer thus working to lower, not increase, the rate of inflation.

Due to the inelastic demand for food, a 1 percent decrease in supply of food generally results in a 3 to 4 percent increase in price to the consumer. Again both producers and consumers are being hurt. Producers are being denied profits they should receive from the production their land is capable of producing, and consumers are being forced to pay considerably more for their food because of artificially created food shortages.

The grain that would not be produced in this country next year because of the fertilizer we do not have, due to the fertilizer sold abroad, will translate into sizable increases in food prices to the consumer. It is time we act now as to avert another food crisis. The farmers of America want to produce, but they have to have the fertilizer to do it.

I realize the administration is interested in encouraging exports to reverse the balance of trade, but it is shortsighted to encourage the export of fertilizer by artificially holding domestic fertilizer prices substantially below the world market price. The food this fertilizer would produce would represent far more export dollar sales and do far more in the long run to reverse our balance of trade deficit.

The Department of Agriculture tells us 25 million more acres of farmland are being put into production. Yet because of the artificially created fertilizer shortage caused by phase IV, farmers of America are not going to have much more fertilizer this fall and next spring than they did the previous year. I say the consumers of this country are being hoodwinked by being told, on the one hand by the USDA, that 25 million more acres of farmland are being put into production, while on the other hand establishing a freeze on domestic fertilizer prices, forcing fertilizer material abroad, and creating shortages in America which means fertilizer would not be available for the extra 25 million acres.

Does the administration want more food produced or not? I know Congress does, and they can show it by supporting my bill. By lifting the freeze on fertilizer prices it will allow the price of fertilizer in America to be competitive with the world market price, and in that kind of free enterprise competitive situation I know the American farmer will be willing to outbid his foreign competitors.

JINOTTI CONSTANT BLOOD INFUSER DISCOVERY CALLED "MOST FANTASTIC IN WORLD"

HON. EDWARD J. PATTEN

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. PATTEN. Mr. Speaker, Middlesex County, N.J., contains many talented persons and one of the most versatile and notable is Walter Jinotti, a technologist in Middlesex General Hospital, New Brunswick, N.J.

Mr. Jinotti, who calls himself an "inveterate tinker," gained renown last year when he created a new method of measuring the pollen count—a system adopted by the New York and New Jersey Air Resources Council.

However, Mr. Jinotti's most recent discovery is one that has attracted national acclaim—the Jinotti Constant Blood Infuser Discovery. This device, called by Dr. Herbert Brody, Middlesex General Hospital chief urologist as "undoubtedly the most fantastic unit of its kind in the world," will probably help save thousands of lives. The Jinotti discovery will be especially valuable in open heart surgery, bleeding ulcers, and other conditions.

Mr. Speaker, I'm proud of this fine discovery by one of my constituents, Walter Jinotti, on his distinguished discovery. The Home News of New Brunswick, N.J., in its September 15, 1973, edition, published an excellent article called, "City Man's Life-Saving Device Called Most Fantastic in World." I insert it in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD with deep pride and satisfaction with the knowledge that Walter Jinotti will discover other devices that help mankind:

CITY MAN'S LIFE-SAVING DEVICE CALLED MOST
FANTASTIC IN WORLD
(By Robert Marino)

NEW BRUNSWICK.—Walter Jinotti's rapid, life-saving blood transfusion device yesterday was declared "ready for the world" by its inventor for the second time in three years.

This time the pressure infuser has been modified using lighter plastic instead of aluminum, and it contains a heating device which can pump closely packed cells without damaging them.

The occasion for the second unveiling was the announcement that Taylor Instrument of Arden, N.C., the largest manufacturer of blood pressure measuring devices, will manufacture the infuser.

Jinotti, 47, is chief technologist of the vascular and research laboratory at Middlesex General Hospital, and is best known for his pioneer work in pollen counts as a measure of discomfort for hay fever sufferers.

In May of 1970 he announced that Baxter Laboratories of Chicago, Ill., bought his device and would market it worldwide.

"They (Taylor Instruments) shelved the thing (pressure infuser) at the time and tried to hold me up on it. I could see they didn't want it, and it would never get off the ground," the city resident told The Home News.

Jinotti said the firm manufactures a nylon infusion device that most hospitals use.

Three months after signing the contract, Jinotti arranged to have it broken, he said, and began modifying it again. About 1½ years ago, he contacted Taylor Instrument and a new bond was formed, according to Taylor's vice president of engineering, C. Forster Aldridge.

At yesterday's unveiling of the Tyco's Pressure Infuser (Jinotti type) were several Middlesex General Hospital physicians who had used Jinotti's prototypes successfully in emergency situations requiring rapid transfusions. Democratic gubernatorial candidate Brendan Byrne, Mayor Patricia Q. Sheehan and other hospital representatives and guests.

The problem with the old-style infuser, Jinotti demonstrated, was the time needed to load it, pump it up to pressure and the constant need to man the pressure bulb.

While Jinotti's assistant loaded a plastic blood bladder into the older flexible bag, secured the openings so it would be airtight, and pumped it up—which took slightly more than a minute—Jinotti slipped a blood bag into the open end of his hard plastic infuser, turned a crank several times and was ready in 15 seconds.

His is a shoebox-shaped device, spring-loaded to maintain almost constant pressure while a pint of blood is fed into a person's veins.

In contrast, the air pressure bag in the nylon bag has to be pumped up 20 to 25 times while the bag is emptying.

Although the pressure in the Jinotti device is not constant as the blood bag empties, the degree to which pressure is lost is negligible. Aldridge said the device falls within the pressure standards set for military procurement, while the nylon bag does not.

The one disadvantage, he acknowledged, is that the nylon infuser can be rolled up and carried compactly on the battlefield, while the larger Tyco's infuser's shape cannot be changed.

Sometimes surgeons want their patients to receive warm blood, Jinotti said. This is accomplished by slipping a heating element into the cavity alongside the blood bag.

With the addition of spacers in the cavity, the pump can handle blood in which some of the liquid has been removed. These closely packed blood cells can be damaged under high pressure, but Aldridge said the pressure in the Tyco's infuser is correct.

"That's what took us so damn long to get right. We designed that spring for seven months," he said.

Aldridge said his company plans to produce 4,000 units of the \$45 device, and already has orders from hospitals in Washington, D.C., Atlanta, Ga., and Pittsburgh, Pa., where it was field tested.

It was not field tested at Middlesex because of the "pride-of-ownership" effect, he said, but several staff physicians were on hand to endorse the infuser, as some did three years ago.

Dr. Herbert Brody, Middlesex General chief urologist, praised it as "undoubtedly the most fantastic unit of its kind in the world." He told of an elderly patient with prostatic bleeding who survived because Jinotti's device was able to pump two pints into him in 15 minutes.

Dr. Maxwell Borow, a general and thoracic surgeon, said he used it at least four times during emergencies, particularly when gunshot wound victims needed rapid transfusions.

The ability of the pump to rapidly infuse cancer drugs into localized areas of the body may help to control, although not cure, the

disease, according to Dr. Robert Zullo, chief of the medical oncology section.

Massive bleeding of the gastrointestinal system can cause shock and irreversible damage to other organs, a condition that can be avoided by rapid blood infusion, according to Dr. Jack Rubin, chief of gastroenterology.

Dr. Norman Rosenberg, chairman of the surgery department, praised Jinotti's resourcefulness and called his invention "an old-fashioned demonstration of energy and enterprise."

Jinotti has been working on the principle of constant pressure infusion for five years. He said he has sunk about \$45,000 into the project and will get royalties when the units are sold.

Taylor Instruments will manufacture them under his patent.

Jinotti presented the first units to some of the physicians who aided him in the development, to St. Peter's General and Middlesex General hospitals, and to Byrne, whom he invited.

"In the field I'm in, where there is a great deal of bloodletting, I appreciate this more than any of you," Byrne said wryly.

Asked what he plans to do with it, he replied he has a lot of doctors in his family.

NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION SUPPORTS DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA HOME RULE

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, there is broad support all across the country for granting the citizens of the District of Columbia the basic right to govern themselves.

The irony of more than 800,000 people in the District of Columbia being denied the basic democratic right to an elected local government is a perplexing concept to millions of schoolchildren in America.

The National Education Association, with 1.2 million members in all parts of the United States, supports the home rule bill soon to be voted on in the House. I want to draw the attention of my colleagues to their statement on this subject:

STATEMENT OF THE NATIONAL EDUCATION ASSOCIATION

The 1.2 million members of the National Education Association are appreciative of this opportunity to submit testimony again in favor of self-government for the citizens of the District of Columbia.

Significant first steps have already been taken. The Association applauded the legislation which provided for a popularly-elected School Board for the District. Now further steps are before you.

The Association believes that three basic elements essential to the establishment of a true and workable form of self-government are: first, locally elected officials, including a mayor and city council; second, control by elected District officials over the District of Columbia's budget; and third, automatic payment of federal funds to compensate for the heavy concentration of nontaxable federal and international buildings within the District.

We have noted with interest the testimony presented by Mr. Sterling Tucker and others, representing the Metropolitan Coalition for Self-Determination for the District of Columbia before this Subcommittee on April 3,

1973. Although the National Education Association has taken no specific actions which would dictate support or lack of support for any of the details offered in the testimony, we believe that adoption of the suggestions made by the Metropolitan Coalition would satisfy the three basic elements above which we consider essential for meaningful self-government.

The Association has long been on record in favor of complete Home Rule for the District of Columbia. Educators across the country, who daily teach the history and development of representative government in the United States, the most durable democracy yet created, consider it ironic that 800,000 people in the nation's Capital City are denied the basic democratic right to a local government responsible to them at the polls.

The Declaration of Independence says it well—that in order to secure the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness, "governments are instituted among men, deriving their just powers from the consent of the governed . . ." For the last hundred years residents of the District of Columbia have been governed by powers not derived from their consent, but from the consent of the citizens of the several states. It is basic to the principles set down by Jefferson and the other brave men meeting in Philadelphia that governments at all levels should be elected by, and therefore answerable to, the citizens governed. Only in the District of Columbia is this principle violated, and we urge a speedy and effective remedy.

An elected mayor and city council, and indeed an elected school board also, have in fact no powers unless they are able to make decisions concerning the financial affairs of the District. It would be an exercise in futility for a governing body to legislate authority to hire more policemen, for example, or to mandate an innovative reading program in the schools, unless that same body could also legislate the financial means to implement the legislation. Therefore we urge that the District of Columbia's budget be controlled by the elected District officials.

And finally, we urge adequate and automatic federal payments to the District government to offset the severe shortage of taxable property within the boundaries of the District caused by the heavy concentration of nontaxable federal and international buildings.

We join with other members of the National Coalition for Self-Determination for D.C. in urging that this Committee take quick and positive action toward granting full rights of citizenship to the residents of our Capital City.

THREE MEN ACHIEVE HIGHEST GOAL OF SCOUTING

HON. JOHN J. DUNCAN

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DUNCAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to recognize before my colleagues three fine young men from Athens, Tenn., who recently achieved the rank of Eagle Scout. In reaching the highest goal of the scouting program, these young people displayed the courage and leadership which will prepare them to take on the responsibility of guiding our great Nation in the future. My own sons were in scouting, and I personally know of the great value of this organization to young men. I have listed their names below.

Roger Barnett, son of Mr. and Mrs. Robert Barnett.

Jeff Ferguson, son of Mrs. Maggie Ferguson.

Wesley Curtis, son of Mr. and Mrs. Lewis Curtis.

LOW CHOLESTEROL DIET AND HEART DISEASE

HON. LOUIS FREY, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. FREY. Mr. Speaker, a medical research program which recently came to my attention demonstrates a new approach to medical research.

The program, conducted by the National Heart and Lung Institute, seeks to determine once and for all whether lowering cholesterol will stop, retard or reverse the progression of heart disease in patients with premature heart disease.

It is estimated that Americans spend more than \$500 million annually on cholesterol lowering medications and on low cholesterol foods.

Researchers believe 30,000 deaths of persons under the age of 65 could be prevented each year if cholesterol lowering is found to be effective in preventing heart disease and Americans switch to a low cholesterol diet.

In addition to finding the answer to the possible relationship between cholesterol and heart disease, the program is evaluating a new technique for detecting early heart disease in patients before they develop chest pains or have heart attacks.

The detection system is cheap, easy, harmless and quick and can be made readily available for screening large populations for heart disease.

Cost of this program at the National Heart and Lung Institute is relatively low when compared to many other Government sponsored research programs but the benefits are many.

The Institute is working through physicians in the Washington, D.C. area to identify persons who may qualify for the research program.

Additionally, thousands of Government employees are having their cholesterol levels checked in an effort to find others who may qualify for the research program.

Still other screening programs are being conducted by suburban heart associations.

A person entering the national heart and lung research program is not only helping his fellow man by aiding researchers attempting to find a possible link between cholesterol levels and heart disease but is afforded free medical diagnosis, therapy and evaluation.

Researchers have already discovered more than 250 medical abnormalities in persons referred to the program because of the in-depth examinations and evaluation.

Programs of this nature, through their upgrading of individual medical care as well as the general increase in medical

care and knowledge in the community more than justifies their expenses and are among the best buys for taxpayers.

It is also refreshing to know this program was built around quality patient care and service and to realize that in this period of cutbacks in Government expenditures there is no sacrifice in personal patient care.

All too often we find medical research projects are isolated from the community and the general population does not derive any immediate benefits from the testing and research.

In this case, however, the more than 250 persons ultimately selected for the 2-year project and the thousands of persons screened are receiving needed medical advice, advice which will in many cases help them to prolong their lives through proper medication and diet.

We, in Congress, should encourage others in the field of medical research to follow the example set by the National Heart and Lung Institute in its effort to determine any relationship between cholesterol levels and heart disease.

I commend Dr. Theodore Cooper, Director of the Institute, and Dr. Donald Frederickson, Scientific Director, for their foresight to shift personnel and moneys into this program, keeping overall costs low while at the same time maintaining a high level of quality patient care.

Dr. Robert Levy and Dr. Stephen Epstein, codirectors of the project, should also be commended for their efforts to administer the project and keep area physicians abreast of their findings.

There are three other dedicated doctors, John Brenske, Gene Passamani and John Richardson, who also deserve commendation for their many hours of dealing with the hundreds of persons screened thus far in the program and for their hours of counseling and examining those persons who are targets for one of America's top killers—heart disease.

MAGAZINE FOOD EDITOR SUPPORTS PURE FISH BILL

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on September 11, I introduced the Pure Fish and Fishery Products Act of 1973, which would improve the poor hygienic conditions currently prevalent in the fish industry by establishing a mandatory program of inspection and licensing.

The bill has been well received by concerned consumers and professionals. The letter printed below sent to me by the food editor of Redbook magazine, is but one indication of this growing support, and reveals the need for public hearings. The letter follows:

Redbook,
New York, N.Y., September 26, 1973.
Congressman Jonathan Bingham,
New York, N.Y.

DEAR CONGRESSMAN BINGHAM: I applaud your efforts to improve the quality of seafood by introducing legislation.

I often buy frozen fish in the supermarket. Occasionally it tastes horribly of diesel oil as though it has been sloshing around the bottom of a boat. When this happens of course I return it to the supermarket. But it should not happen.

I think if the quality of the fish available in supermarkets (which is the only place many people can buy fish) were improved, sales of fish would rise considerably. I am sure the seafood industry loses customers each time someone buys aged and smelly fish in the supermarket. (Often if fish is not sold by the end of Saturday it is refrozen and then brought out again the following week).

A practice that leads to poor quality fish is the practice of freezing fish in blocks on board ship. The supermarket then has to thaw the fish before it can be packed in retail sizes—with subsequent loss of quality. The fish is then labeled "Thawed for your convenience" which is so much nonsense. It would be better to sell the fish frozen (it thaws in just a few minutes).

As you may gather, the quality of fish is something I feel strongly about and I am glad someone is finally taking steps to improve the situation.

Yours sincerely,

ELIZABETH ALSTON,
Food Editor.

WINNING BACK THE PEOPLE'S RESPECT

HON. JOSEPH M. GAYDOS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. GAYDOS. Mr. Speaker, the all-volunteer Armed Forces program, now almost a year in operation, is not living up to the expectations of its original proponents or others in Congress who supported the idea. Last month, for example, the enlistment rate dropped to 89 percent, according to the Defense Department.

However, I agree fully with Senator JOHN C. STENNIS, chairman of the Senate's Armed Services Committee, that the plan should have a "full test and fair trial." He wants it tried for 2 more years at least before any consideration is given to restoring the draft.

The 2 years could be time enough to permit the Pentagon to get the all-volunteer story across to the Nation's youth, the story of the multiplicity of educational and vocational opportunities which the program provides enlistees, both male and female, and which are unequalled anywhere.

But success in the numbers recruited is not enough. The volunteer services again must be made accepted and honored parts of American life. We still are in an age of antimilitarism which resulted mostly from our frustrations over the war in Vietnam. Millions of our people and especially the young, have been turned off on the subject of military power in any form.

And still, rational judgment shows any of us that this Nation has to maintain a military posture with forces unsurpassed in strength in a world that continues dangerous. General MacArthur once said that wars are caused mainly by unguarded riches. I feel this theory still has

validity and that our country has much to guard and cannot relax as long as others hold the means of attacking our points of vital interest.

Thus, the volunteer Armed Forces must in the coming years fulfill the national need of having men and women in uniform. These people, I am sure, can be attracted in required numbers once the opportunities for individual self-improvement are demonstrated along with the possibilities for exciting adventures. But these young people also must be placed in situations whereby they can bring total public respect back to the Military Establishment and win again for it the gratitude which a nation owes its Armed Forces in peace as well as in war.

This is a big order. It is one which demands the best thinking and planning which the Pentagon can muster. It, too, bears heavily upon us here in Congress. How can we make the all-volunteer services concept work both as a military matter and as an institution meriting the popular faith in it? We can begin by agreeing now to give it the full test and the fair trial called for by Senator STENNIS for as many years as may be necessary.

TRANSPORTATION FOR SMALL CITIES

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the Urban Mass Transportation Act may appear at first glance to be designed primarily for the benefit of large cities. While it would certainly aid them with their transit systems and the related problems of pollution, congestion, and parking, there is at least an equal benefit to be derived by medium and small cities such as we have in Iowa.

It is true that in its origins mass transit assistance legislation had as its pivot the problems of large cities. Subsequently, however, the 1970 act recognized that medium and small cities had major transportation stresses as well, and Congress encouraged their participation in the program.

In the words of the committee's report accompanying this bill:

The real crisis in urban transportation today is the almost total breakdown of private bus companies in small cities.

Many small cities, which have had bus companies in the past, have no bus operations at all today, or they are threatened with losing their remaining service because of severe operating deficits.

Small local governments, in most cases, do not have the financial and taxing ability to purchase and run a bus company or to subsidize the operating deficits of private systems. This bill would authorize grants to States and local governments to remedy this situation. With fares and local funds providing from 80 to 85 percent of the operating costs, and with the size of the

grants based in part on the number of passengers, it seems fair to assume that the Federal assistance would be used wisely.

The need for these subsidies in Iowa is immediate. For example, two cities in my district, Dubuque and Clinton, were informed this year that the private company providing bus service would discontinue operations because of continuing operating deficits. The cities were given the option of buying the company's capital equipment at nominal cost, but there is still the harsh prospect of offsetting the operational deficit anticipated in the next few years. This bill would provide much needed help.

All of us share to a certain degree the need for public transportation. We are seeking at least a partial alternative to the automobile with its accompanying pollution, relatively high energy consumption, congestion, and the requirements imposed for roads and parking spaces.

But the need is even greater for those who cannot afford a car and yet must still get to work. And there are those who cannot drive and depend on public transportation for their mobility—the elderly, the handicapped, and others. Without some form of public transportation, these people will be prisoners in their homes.

Mr. Speaker, I support this bill, and I urge all who are concerned about the needs of the Nation's small cities to join me in this support.

TRAGIC PLIGHT OF THE SOVIET JEWS

HON. MARIO BIAGGI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BIAGGI. Mr. Speaker, the support for the Mills-Vanik amendment continues to grow across the United States as more and more Americans become aware of the tragic plight of the Soviet Jew. The Young Americans for Freedom at the conclusion of their seventh annual convention adopted a resolution entitled "The Right to Leave" which indicated their support of this important measure. I am hopeful that the full House will follow the example of the Ways and Means Committee, and adopt this amendment to once again show the Soviet Union that the concern in the United States for the Soviet Jew remains strong and unified.

Mr. Speaker, I insert in the RECORD the full text of the YAF resolution.

The resolution follows:

THE RIGHT TO LEAVE

There are numerous nations throughout the world that labor under tyrannical governments which deny their citizens many basic individual rights, including the right to worship, freedom of speech, press, assembly, and property. In a good number of these nations, the citizens are forbidden to make the ultimate decision to emigrate. This has been most notably true of the Soviet Union and Eastern European bloc countries where Jews and Christians, various ethnic

minorities, dissident students, scientists, writers, artists, and intellectuals suffer severe persecution. This tragedy also exists in Cuba, East Germany and Communist China have made it official policy to kill those attempting to leave.

Unfortunately, the United States government has frequently disregarded the despicable treatment accorded to human beings entrapped in such circumstances. In fact, in most cases, the United States has extended diplomatic recognition and opened trade with such nations.

In order to cope with this tragedy, the Young Americans for Freedom resolve to support the Right of Emigration Bill proposed by Senator Henry Jackson and Representative Wilbur Mills which would deny "most favored nation" treatment and participation in credit guarantees to any such nation unless that nation allows its citizens to emigrate. Young Americans for Freedom further resolves that the Jackson-Mills proposal is an important first step in the exercise of the responsibility of the United States in promoting the cause of freedom throughout the world.

THE GREAT PROTEIN ROBBERY: NO. 4

HON. GERRY E. STUDDS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. STUDDS. Mr. Speaker, the serious depletion of our marine resources caused by massive foreign fishing fleets operating in the waters off New England has been of great concern for some time to many people in my home State of Massachusetts. They have recognized that existing international agreements have proven ineffective in preserving our valuable marine resources from depletion.

In an attempt to prod Washington into action, and as a symbolic gesture of defiance, the Massachusetts Legislature in 1971 passed legislation, signed into law by the Governor, extending the territorial rights of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to the edge of the Continental Shelf. The legislature and the Governor have taken other independent actions in behalf of the threatened marine resources in New England coastal waters. I believe it is time now for Washington to act to protect those same marine resources—resources that are an invaluable food supply and source of protein for all the people of the world.

Accordingly, I have introduced legislation, H.R. 8665, to extend U.S. fisheries jurisdiction out to 200 miles from our coast. This action would allow us to protect our marine resources and stop the great protein robbery by huge foreign fishing fleets occurring right now off our shores.

On September 25, 1973, Gov. Francis W. Sargent of Massachusetts delivered a speech in Gloucester, Mass., before representatives of the New England commercial fishing industry. I would like to insert a copy of this speech into the RECORD at this time:

SPEECH BY GOV. FRANCIS W. SARGENT

I am delighted to be in Gloucester today—a city where fishing is not simply a tradition,

but a way of life . . . and, most importantly where the battle for the survival of the fishing industry is centered.

Most of you understand this battle better than I. For day in and day out you live under the threat that soon there may be no more fish to take.

I shall not mince words with you today. What the industry confronts here in Gloucester . . . and in all of Massachusetts . . . is the eventual disappearance of cod . . . of haddock . . . and of lobster.

This danger exists because we in this nation have permitted the reckless and irresponsible depletion of these marine resources by foreign vessels.

The threat to these species originates not in Boston or Gloucester or New Bedford, but in Poland, Russia and Japan.

Two years ago I advised a New England fisheries luncheon in Boston that time was drawing short for the fisheries. To the continuing problem of foreign competition had come a new danger—the very depletion of the basic fishing resource.

Two years ago it became crystal clear that the international regulatory machinery was not working. There were no strong sanctions. There was little enforcement.

In fact, the indifference of other nations to the plight of the basic resource had assumed the proportions of an international scandal.

Two years have passed and that scandal continues.

During that period, Massachusetts has not tamely accepted the fate being arranged for its fisheries.

In 1971, I signed into law, legislation extending the territorial rights of the Commonwealth to the edge of the Continental Shelf. This action has raised grave constitutional questions, and in fact, this law is currently being challenged in the courts by the federal government.

When I signed the legislation, I knew full well the risks involved. Yet, the federal government was doing nothing to save our marine resources. I was convinced we had to act on our own.

More recently, for these same reasons, I moved to protect the lobster.

Again we faced persistent federal inaction. For months Massachusetts fishermen have been pleading with the bureaucrats in Washington to declare the lobster a creature of the Shelf, and thereby protect it. They refused.

Consequently, I encouraged my Director of Marine Fisheries to hold hearings on draft regulations on the taking of lobsters within two hundred miles of our coast.

Now again, these actions presented constitutional problems. Yet I felt we had no choice but to try to accomplish at the state level what should have been done at the federal level.

Moreover, through these actions, I hoped to force officials in Washington to see that their course of action was bringing disaster to the New England fisherman.

To emphasize the danger and to make our commitment clear, I sent three top state officials, including the Secretary of Environmental Affairs, to Copenhagen, Denmark to attend the annual meeting of ICNAF. This is the international body which regulates fishing in our region. And this is the organization which has refused to act.

For the first time—we saw a ray of hope—our pleas for action were heard at the Copenhagen Conference.

For the first time, the United States' government took a hard line.

The American Ambassador stated in strong terms that unless ICNAF acted to protect our resources . . . that unless it stopped ignoring the depletion of our fishing stocks . . . the United States would withdraw from the organization. Yet despite the words of

our Ambassador . . . despite his warnings, the Copenhagen Conference ended in a stalemate.

Nonetheless the battle continues.

Next month in Ottawa, there will be an emergency session of ICNAF to consider regulations for New England. This session is crucial, for unless there is agreement at this time, our fisheries will be unregulated next year and the depletion of resources will seriously worsen.

Therefore, at this time, I renew my request that the federal government stand by its newly voiced commitment to the New England fisheries.

The United States must go to the Ottawa meeting prepared to resign from ICNAF—if ICNAF will not act.

I will do all in my power to encourage such a position—and to this end—I will send several state officials to Ottawa.

In recent months additional initiatives have been taken which may prove highly significant. First, the State Department has negotiated new bilateral agreements with Japan, Poland and the Soviet Union.

Second, and most encouraging, Congress has shown a willingness to protect our fishing resources.

Legislation has been introduced by Senator Warren Magnuson, of Washington, long a leader in this field and by our own Congressman Gerry Studds. Their proposals are similar to existing state legislation to extend national fisheries jurisdiction two hundred miles from our coast. This limit will remain until effective international treaties on fishing are signed and enforced.

The Magnuson-Studds legislation comes at a critical period. For it will provide the regulatory authority necessary if the United States does withdraw from ICNAF.

I strongly urge all of you to join with me in endorsing this legislation.

I have already written Senator Magnuson and Representative Studds urging that hearings be held on this legislation in New England, and, further, that these hearings be held as soon as possible. Additionally, I am writing the Governors of each of the coastal states asking them to join with me in endorsing this legislation.

It has taken two years and extraordinary action by this state to move the Federal Government off ground zero.

Finally, however, Washington is moving. And so, I will hold off any further unilateral actions on our part until the beginning of next year. For us alone to act when we finally are getting the type of national policy we need would harm, not help our cause.

Nonetheless, we shall not stand still during this period. There remain two very important areas that we can move in at the state level to directly affect the fishing industry.

First, as you may know, I recently established an Emergency Commission on Food. This Commission will spend seven months examining the food system in Massachusetts, including marine and aqua products.

To insure the necessary expertise I have asked Dr. George Matthiessen, the President of Marine Research, Inc., to serve as a member of that Commission.

Secondly, I have placed before my staff and my Secretaries the task of quickly developing a Coastal Zone Plan—For we must decide soon how we shall use both our coastline, and our marine resources.

These then are the actions that this state is taking across a broad front to preserve its fishing industry.

This will not be an easy battle to win. You who have fought long know that quite well.

But it is a battle we must fight to the end. Because at stake is a heritage of the sea stretching for more than three centuries.

It is a heritage we cannot afford to lose.

JEWISH IMMIGRATION

HON. JEROME R. WALDIE

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. WALDIE. Mr. Speaker, incidents which have transpired over recent days in Austria have, unfortunately, added one more tragic footnote in the long and troubled history of the Jewish community in the Soviet Union.

Despite pleas from the highest places in the Governments of Israel and the United States, the Government of Austria has declared firm its intention to close the Schoenau Castle transit camp in Vienna.

Certainly there was a deep concern expressed by Austrian authorities over the safety of hostages held by Arab terrorists in the Schoenau incident. I think, however, that the concern expressed and the Austrian Government action which followed failed to take into account the always slow, perennially bitter struggle Soviet Jews have endured to acquire the human right to emigrate.

The frustration of persecution and setback is not a new experience for the Jewish people attempting to leave the Soviet Union for migration to Israel. But the conduct of Austrian officials, in light of a previous record of understanding and cooperation with the immigrants, is difficult to comprehend at this time.

The struggle for freedom is never an easy task and no people know the day-to-day facts better than the colony of Soviet Jews attempting a return to their native soil. It is unfortunate that lessons of history, even in the short span of time from World War II, are so quickly forgotten.

Chancellor Kreisky has steadfastly refused to alter his hasty decision despite the protests of this Government and the Secretary-General of the United Nations. His statement that "I shall not cancel my government's decision even if anyone from the President of the United States on down should demand it" is perhaps the comment one would expect from a politician more bent on politics than reality.

The President of the United States has shown his intentions in this matter and I call upon Members of the House and Senate to indicate their will and sentiment as well. I do not consider my support for maintenance of this immigration transit camp as an idle act—as perhaps Chancellor Kreisky may be interpreting the words of anyone in this Nation who vouches for the open travel privileges for Jews between the Soviet Union and Israel. I strongly urge all members of the House to think likewise and inform Chancellor Kreisky of their intentions.

Sovereignty and the protection of individual rights within any form of government must be a guarantee provided to all citizens. There is in my belief, however, a sense of sovereignty for human dignity which transcends all political borders. The Government of Israel has understood that throughout the years of

its struggle for survival. I believe all Members of this House should extend, in their own ways, the same sentiment to Chancellor Kriesky.

TIMBER CUTTING ON THE PUBLIC LANDS

HON. HENRY S. REUSS

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. REUSS. Mr. Speaker, despite the directives of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, the Government has become preoccupied with timber harvesting in the national forests to the detriment of wildlife and recreation. The following editorial from the September 28, 1973, Louisville Courier-Journal tells the story:

PUBLIC FORESTS: ARE NOT THEY THE PEOPLE'S BUSINESS, TOO?

The Federal government is in the timber business—make no mistake about that. Among them, the U.S. Forest Service, the Bureau of Land Management and the Bureau of Indian Affairs manage 121 million acres of commercial forest land, containing 40 per cent of the nation's commercial timber. Yet the Nixon administration continues to act as though publicly controlled timber resources are not the people's business.

The latest in a long series of administration actions which support this conclusion is President Nixon's endorsement of "substantial" expansion of timbering on public lands—by as much as 50 to 100 per cent in the virgin forests of the Western United States.

This came little more than a month after the General Accounting Office charged that the government is letting timber contractors clear-cut large areas in national forests, then wastefully leave many felled trees behind, thus creating unnecessary fire hazards and hampering forest regeneration. And the GAO report, in turn, followed by only a few weeks the release of a White House budget manual directing the Forest Service to concentrate on getting trees sold and cut, even if it means postponing or canceling programs to help hikers and others use national forests.

Whose interests are being served here? The President calls for more trees to be cut down on public land, in order to meet present and future lumber needs. But what does he say about the Forest Service study showing that an amount of lumber equivalent to one-fifth of the entire harvest on federal lands was left behind on the ground to rot during 1969, on acreage in the Pacific Coast states? What does he recommend concerning the billions of board feet being floated off to Japan each year, thus placing an extra burden on productivity on America's domestic forest resources—a problem which even his advisory panel recognized, in urging negotiation of a reduction in timber exports to Japan?

THE INDUSTRY'S ARGUMENTS

The latter is a complicated question, involving the desperate Japanese need for wood—particularly hemlock and other whitewoods. Japanese imports from the United States totaled about 2.5 billion board feet in 1972, and the timber industry fears not only the loss of that market, but a diversion to Japan of more lumber from British Columbia, thereby bidding up prices in a province that provides one-third of all the lumber used in American homebuilding.

The industry also argues (1) that exports have provided the dollar incentive for it to reduce wastage, by bringing sales stability to a volatile market; (2) that sharply reduced exports would be disastrous for Washington State, which accounts for 82 per cent of all U.S. softwood exports and which could lose an estimated 8,000 jobs directly and 16,000 jobs indirectly; and (3) that the United States would jeopardize the current \$500 million annual contribution made by timber exports to the right side of the balance of payments ledger.

This is a formidable list of caution flags. It suggests that export curbs must be applied gradually, to give the Japanese and their American suppliers time to adjust. But it does not suggest that producers—whether for export or the domestic market—should be allowed to jeopardize public forests.

The national forests are supposed to be operated under terms of the Multiple Use-Sustained Yield Act of 1960, with balanced attention given to various uses (timber, water, wildlife, grazing, recreation, mining). In reality, timbering is the eager preoccupation of those who make the policy for such lands. President Nixon, for example, has boldly ignored the sentiments expressed in congressional action, by arbitrarily boosting the allowable cut in the national forests.

SQUANDERING A LEGACY

This concession to administration friends in the timber-company boardrooms has had destructive consequences, not the least of them an encouragement to ignore good forestry practices in the interest of maximum production. Under normal circumstances it's hard enough to do a good job of clearcutting (removal of all trees in a given area, as opposed to selective cutting of individual trees) without destroying the forest environment. But with both government and industry ranting about the need to speed up and increase the timber cut, careless application of clearcutting is all the more likely.

The results of such a breakdown in proper management could be ruinous, considering the fact that clearcutting is practiced on 60 per cent of the one million acres which private timber concerns are now harvesting in the national forests.

One of the major purposes of our federal government is to provide the American people with ways to protect themselves against the excesses of private interests. The Nixon administration, in encouraging the timbermen as it has encouraged those who strip coal, seems to be trying to repudiate that version of the government's role in American life. Publicly owned forest land is one of the greatest of the many natural legacies inherited by the American people. It's surely a legacy to be protected rather than squandered.

NATIONAL EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED WEEK

HON. JOHN BRADEMAS

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAS. Mr. Speaker, I want to call to my colleagues' attention to the fact that next week, the week of October 7, has been designated "National Employ the Handicapped Week, 1973."

Said President Nixon in signing the proclamation:

Perhaps the greatest difficulty a handicapped person faces is not his own disability, but rather the attitudes of society concern-

ing that disability. Yet, handicapped people are able to perform a wide range of jobs with great skill and efficiency. The employer who hires the handicapped is not only helping them; he is also helping himself and his country.

Mr. Speaker, happily we will be observing National Employ the Handicapped Week in the context of the President's finally having recently signed, after two successive vetoes, the Rehabilitation Act of 1973.

So that my colleagues can understand the significance of this week to the 7 millions of handicapped citizens of our land, I insert the proclamation at this point in the RECORD:

PROCLAMATION 4245—NATIONAL EMPLOY THE HANDICAPPED WEEK, 1973

A PROCLAMATION

This country was founded upon a promise made to all of its people: that our government would work to assure every citizen a fair and equal start in the race of life. Implicit in this promise is the concept that a person has a right to compete for any job he is able to perform.

This promise has been kept for a great many of our people, but not for all. Too many handicapped persons—particularly young disabled veterans—are unable to find work.

Perhaps the greatest difficulty a handicapped person faces is not his own disability, but rather the attitudes of society concerning that disability. Yet handicapped people are able to perform a wide range of jobs with great skill and efficiency. The employer who hires the handicapped is not only helping them; he is also helping himself and his country.

Let us all work therefore to make good on the promise America has always held out to its people—allowing each person who is willing to work and who is qualified to work a fair chance to work.

Now, therefore, I, Richard Nixon, President of the United States of America, in accordance with a joint resolution of the Congress approved August 11, 1945, as amended (36 U.S.C. 155), do hereby proclaim the week of October 7, 1973, as National Employ the Handicapped Week.

I urge the Nation's Governors, mayors, and all other public officials, as well as leaders in every area of American life, to join with the handicapped themselves in making this observance a time of new awakening in our country to the value and the importance of employing handicapped men and women.

In witness whereof, I have hereunto set my hand this eighteenth day of September, in the year of our Lord nineteen hundred seventy-three, and of the Independence of the United States of America the one hundred ninety-eighth.

RICHARD NIXON.

MIA'S—THE FORGOTTEN ONES

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, not getting much attention except by those who are missing a loved one is the fate of 1,243 American men missing in action in Vietnam, Cambodia, and Laos. The return of American POW's was met,

as it should be, with great rejoicing. There was no rejoicing nor even news for the families of these other 1,243 men.

The North Vietnamese are obligated by the January 27, 1973, Paris Agreements on Vietnam. Article 8, paragraph (b) states:

The parties shall help each other to get information about those military personnel and foreign civilians of the parties missing in action, to determine the location and take care of the graves of the dead so as to facilitate the exhumation and repatriation of the remains, and to take any such other measures as may be required to get information about those still considered missing in action.

The responsibility of the North Vietnamese to aid American efforts in this regard is clear. In the supplemental agreements of June 13, 1973, article 8, paragraph (b) was reemphasized.

The U.S. Government has established the joint casualty resolution center—JCRC—at Nakhon Phanom, Thailand, to determine the status and investigate reports about American MIA's. On May 11 and May 18, 1973, members of the JCRC, as part of the four-party military team, were allowed to go to Hanoi. In Hanoi they were shown the alleged burial sites of U.S. servicemen. The North Vietnamese Communists would not allow the exhumation of the bodies. No determination could be made if Americans were actually buried there and if they were Americans, who they were.

The North Vietnamese Communists have not allowed the JCRC back into

North Vietnam. The Vietcong and North Vietnamese Communists in South Vietnam have refused searches in territory they hold.

In the original Paris agreements the United States agreed to and did pull out its troops, restrict the amount of supplies sent to the free South Vietnamese, and gave a number of other concessions. The North Vietnamese and Vietcong agreed to release American POW's, to help locate American MIA's and the bodies of American men killed in action, and to restrict their activities in South Vietnam.

Eighty-three Americans have been identified in either pictures or by those POW's who returned home as having been held prisoner by the North Vietnamese. The North Vietnamese have released no information on these men. While the likelihood of these 83 still being alive is slight, there is no military reason for the North Vietnamese being as cruel and inhuman as they are being in this matter.

The Paris agreements are clear. Hanoi made pledges which it has broken. Once again the Communists have broken an agreement that they have signed.

I urge all Americans to demand an accounting of our more than 1,200 MIA's. This is no time to consider initiating any type of political, cultural, economic, or diplomatic relations with the North Vietnamese. Also, we should discourage our allies from giving any aid to North Vietnam. The North Vietnamese have ex-

pressed their contempt for the accords that they signed by their actions in South Vietnam and by their complete unwillingness to provide information on our MIA's.

QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS OF THE 11TH DISTRICT OF INDIANA

HON. WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. HUDNUT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the tabulation of my questionnaire, so that my colleagues in the Congress may know what the people in the 11th District of Indiana are thinking.

The questionnaire follows:

WASHINGTON, D.C., October 5, 1973.

Earlier this year you received a series of questions from my office dealing with governmental issues of current interest. Over 15,000 replies to those questions have now been received and tabulated. In this newsletter I wish to report the results of that survey and comment on the issues presented. If you wish more detailed answers relating to a particular question, please feel free to write me. My staff stands ready to serve you, so don't hesitate to contact them if the need arises. With best wishes, I am,

Sincerely yours,

WILLIAM H. HUDNUT III,

Member of Congress.

[In percent]

Age	Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
1. Do you think Congress should place a ceiling on annual spending as a means of combating inflationary Federal spending?				
18 to 27.....	84	16	88	12
28 to 41.....	86	14	90	10
42 to 57.....	95	5	93	7
Over 57.....	96	4	96	4
Total.....	90	10	92	8
If budget limits and spending ceilings are set and respected, it will help us hold the line on Federal spending and thus be a deterrent to continuing inflation. I have introduced a bill to require a balanced Federal budget except in times of emergency.				
2. The proposed budget for fiscal year 1974 calls for expenditures of some \$268,000,000,000. Would you favor a tax increase to fund additional programs beyond that amount?				
18 to 27.....	8	92	6	94
28 to 41.....	10	90	6	94
42 to 57.....	4	96	4	96
Over 57.....	5	95	3	97
Total.....	7	92	5	95
No. The American people are burdened with enough taxes now. I promised to vote to hold the line on Government spending and resist any tax increase and will continue to fulfill that pledge.				
3. Do you favor giving aid to North Vietnam after there has been an accounting of our MIA's?				
18 to 27.....	12	88	18	82
28 to 41.....	11	89	12	88
42 to 57.....	11	89	11	89
Over 57.....	6	94	9	91
Total.....	10	90	13	87
The Communists are still fighting us, we won no clear-cut victory as in 1945, and we have more rebuilding than we can handle on the homefront as it is. I feel first priorities should go to rebuilding America.				
4. Should Federal employees be allowed to strike?				
18 to 27.....	53	47	45	55
28 to 41.....	36	64	40	60
42 to 57.....	22	78	24	76
Over 57.....	25	75	20	80
Total.....	35	65	33	67

Age	Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
I prefer emphasizing collective bargaining and binding arbitration in cases where Federal employees differ from existing policies.				
5. Should strikers be eligible to receive food stamps?				
18 to 27.....	21	79	18	82
28 to 41.....	36	64	17	83
42 to 57.....	8	92	9	91
Over 57.....	11	89	9	91
Total.....	15	85	14	86
We certainly don't want anyone in America to go hungry, but I can see no reason why voluntary strikers should be subsidized by the government.				
6. Do you favor increased Federal spending to curb pollution if it means higher taxes?				
18 to 27.....	44	56	48	52
28 to 41.....	35	65	35	65
42 to 57.....	23	77	21	79
Over 57.....	22	78	22	78
Total.....	32	68	31	69
(a) Are you satisfied with the progress that is being made to clean up the environment?				
18 to 27.....	30	70	31	69
28 to 41.....	45	55	39	61
42 to 57.....	61	39	56	44
Over 57.....	62	38	51	49
Total.....	48	52	44	56
(b) Would you be willing to pay more for products and services if their manufacture and use could be made virtually pollution-free?				
18 to 27.....	71	29	80	20
28 to 41.....	65	35	65	35
42 to 57.....	53	47	53	47
Over 57.....	43	57	49	51
Total.....	60	40	62	38

Pollution must be curbed, and it's going to take a lot of money over the next few years, but I would prefer reallocation of existing tax dollars rather than a tax increase.

(In percent)

Age	Male		Female	
	Yes	No	Yes	No
7. Do you feel that a national health insurance program is needed? If yes, which do you prefer?				
18 to 27	57	43	60	40
28 to 41	46	54	44	56
42 to 57	37	63	37	63
Over 57	54	46	54	46
Total	48	52	48	52

	Overall response	Male response	Female response
(a) A program financed and operated by the Federal Government.	29	31	27
(b) A program financed and operated by the Federal Government for welfare dependents and a private insurance program for working people.	32	33	32
(c) Legislation limited to meeting only catastrophic health expenses.	39	36	41

I favor a health insurance program that includes both the public and private sectors in partnership, and offers the greatest assistance where it is needed most, which is among the indigent, and those struck by catastrophic illness.

¹ Grant complete amnesty.
² Be opposed to amnesty.

I know you found that ranking issues in priority fashion is terribly difficult, because they are all important. Right now, however, I believe the three top ones are inflation, integrity in government, and equal opportunity in education, employment, and housing for all Americans.

In conclusion, may I say that I hope this tabulation of our questionnaire, together with my brief statements of my own views, has been of some interest to you. I have inserted the report in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, too, so that my colleagues in the Congress may know what the people in the Eleventh District of Indiana are thinking. We are facing many difficult and in some cases very controversial issues in our nation and in our District right now. I think we must never forget, as we state our views on these matters, that there are truths and principles with regard to which men of good conscience and character may differ; and if we remember that, and respect each other's right to his or her own opinion, we will be true to ideals at the heart of American democracy and protectors of the freedom indispensable thereto.

ANNOUNCEMENT OF HEARINGS ON H.R. 188 AND H.R. 9783

HON. DON EDWARDS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. EDWARDS of California. Mr. Speaker, I would like to announce that the Subcommittee on Civil Rights and Constitutional Rights of the House Committee on the Judiciary will continue hearings on H.R. 188, to amend title 28 of the United States Code to provide for the dissemination and use of criminal arrest records in a manner that insures their security and privacy, and H.R. 9783, to regulate the collection, storage, and dissemination of information by criminal data banks established or supported by the United States.

The hearing will begin on Thursday, October 11, 1973, at 10 a.m. in room 2226,

CXIX—2085—Part 25

Rayburn House Office Building. The subcommittee will hear testimony from Mr. Allen Sill, chief of police, West Covina, Calif.

Those wishing to testify or to submit statements for the record should address their requests to the Committee on the Judiciary, U.S. House of Representatives, Washington, D.C. 20515.

UNINTENDED SUBSIDY

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, an issue which has produced some clear-cut votes in the Congress with the determination apparently having been made this year not to correct the abuse is that of strikers qualifying for food stamps.

The Members may be interested to know that in a recent poll of my constituents, only 17 percent of those responding favored making food stamps available to strikers, while 71 percent opposed it, with 12 percent not sure.

The Press Publications, an independent weekly serving western Cook County and DuPage County, Ill., in a very succinct editorial on September 29, very properly discussed the subject of food stamps for strikers. The editorial follows:

UNINTENDED SUBSIDY

Too often, just about the time construction projects begin to roll again, a strike in the construction industry brings everything to a halt. Instead of getting their jobs done, construction workers spend the summer months carting picket signs around building sites to assure that no work gets accomplished.

When seasonal work combines with strike action, it is sometimes difficult to see how the people involved manage to make enough to live on. The answer, of course, is welfare,

strike benefits, various forms of unemployment insurance and, last but not least, food stamps.

One of the problems is that food stamps issued to striking workers have become one of the major props to strike action, resulting in prolonged disruption of business and industrial activity. It is a taxpayer supported subsidy encouraging the destruction of effective collective bargaining between labor and management. To say the least, this was not the purpose of the program.

This and other abuses of the food stamp program should be corrected by legislative action.

BLUE ISLAND, ILL.: EXCELLENT FIRE AND POLICE PROTECTION

HON. ROBERT P. HANRAHAN

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. HANRAHAN. Mr. Speaker, the city of Blue Island, in the Third Congressional District of Illinois, has for many years provided excellent fire and police protection. Credit for these achievements are due to many people, including the men in various departments. However, it is good leadership within the department which provides the incentive for the remarkable records that have been achieved in Blue Island.

Two of the men who have served Blue Island well, are the fire chief, William J. Barzycki, and the police chief, Harry J. Harczak, Sr. Both of these distinguished men are retiring after years of dedicated service to their community. Chief Barzycki has served the citizens of Blue Island for 28 years and Chief Harczak for 22.

I would like to join with the residents of Blue Island in honoring these fine men for their contribution to the Third Congressional District. Their achievements will long be remembered by the community of Blue Island.

Age	Male and female response			
	A ¹	B ²	C ³	D ⁴
8. For those young men who left the country rather than register for the draft or submit to induction, would you:				
18 to 27	16.4	21.0	45.6	17.0
28 to 41	8.6	27.0	34.2	30.2
42 to 57	6.2	36.2	28.0	29.6
Over 57	2.6	45.0	28.4	24.0
Total	8.5	32.1	34.1	25.3

For draft dodgers and military deserters who desire to reenter the country, I feel strongly that they should appear before the appropriate tribunal for disposition of their case.

Age group (male and female)	Rank of priority			
	18 to 27	28 to 41	42 to 57	Over 57
9. Which of the following issues do you consider the three most important?				
(a) Crime	16.6	22.3	29.7	46.1
(b) Economy	28.9	26.6	26.6	18.5
(c) Education	8.5	6.2	3.6	2.0
(d) Welfare reform	5.5	7.9	9.3	7.9
(e) Housing	0	.2	0	.2
(f) Inflation	11.3	6.4	1.9	.2
(g) Drug rehabilitation	1.9	1.1	2.1	1.0
(h) Mass transit	2.6	.2	.4	1.5
(i) Honesty in Government	23.8	28.1	26.4	22.4
(j) Financial aid for cities	.9	.9	0	.2

¹ Grant conditional amnesty based on service in the Armed Forces or some other public agency.
² Have them prosecuted.

THE FEDERAL BUREAU OF PRISONS'
BEHAVIOR MODIFICATION PRO-
GRAM

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, in order to provide my colleagues with further information regarding the Federal Bureau of Prisons' behavioral modification program, I am placing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, two articles by the well-known columnist, Mr. Tom Wicker, concerning the new Federal Center for Correctional Research at Camp Butner, N.C.

I was deeply impressed by Mr. Wicker's articles and believe that he raises important questions concerning the Bureau of Prisons' involvement in this area. I feel sure that my colleagues will benefit from reading these articles.

The articles follow:

PRISONERS, NOT GUINEA PIGS
(By Tom Wicker)

DURHAM, N.C.—Dr. Martin Groder is a young psychiatrist for the Federal Bureau of Prisons. Contrary to much contemporary thought, he believes in the possibility of rehabilitating prisoners because, he says, "I've done it."

That was at the Federal prison in Marion, Ill., where Dr. Groder (33, and a graduate of both Columbia Medical School and the Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute at the University of California) claims to have had some success with programs "in which the prisoners get interested and invest themselves." He says he relies primarily on "transactional analysis"—about which many people read in Eric Berne's "Games People Play." His ideas also are heavily influenced by two years' work with the Synanon Institute in California, which has been successful in rehabilitating some drug addicts.

Dr. Groder is developing and will be the director of the new Federal Center for Correctional Research, now being built at a cost of \$13.5 million at Camp Butner, an old Army post near here. It is scheduled to open in 1974 with a staff of 211, with 140 psychiatric beds for short-term treatment of severely disturbed Federal prisoners, and places for 200 other selected prisoners in four "research units."

These plans run counter to at least two main lines of thought among modern penologists and organizations interested in corrections. One such line is that prisons themselves are the real correctional problem—that no rehabilitation program can overcome the bad effect of the institution itself on the prisoner. The National Council on Crime and Delinquency, for example, is critical of the Bureau of Prisons' \$60-million construction program, of which the Federal Center at Butner is a part. The council advocates instead "community correction programs that deal with the offender in his own community."

Prison-run "behavior research" is in bad odor, moreover, among those who have studied its workings at such state institutions as Vacaville in California and Patuxent in Maryland. This is because, under the guise of mental treatment of patients, such institutions have done things to prisoners—electroshock, psychosurgery, massive drugging, and the like—to which no court would sentence them; and because some of these institutions have seized on indeterminate sentencing procedures to keep prisoners under such treatment long past the time they might have served in an ordinary prison. Generally, most prison "rehabilita-

tion" programs have been charged with trying mainly to produce docile prisoners, rather than stable citizens.

Martin Groder is cheerfully aware, therefore, that the new Federal Center he will head is suspect in some circles—not least among Federal prisoners, who are not anxious to be "guinea pigs" in behavior research. He is nevertheless pressing ahead in the belief that a major contribution to corrections problems can be made at Butner. He argues that the new center is already an improvement on the original Bureau of Prisons plan to use the Butner site for a big combined prison and mental hospital—what Dr. Groder says would have been a "psychiatric warehouse" for disturbed prisoners.

As for the evils of "behavioral research" in other prisons, both Dr. Groder, in an interview at his office in Durham, and his superiors in Washington firmly deny that the Federal Center at Camp Butner will employ such "treatment." Among the 200 prisoners to be assigned to the research units from other Federal prisons, there will be none with indeterminate sentences, for one thing, so the center will have no power to hold them past their scheduled release dates.

Dr. Groder argues, on a professional basis, that "repressive methods that push people around" don't work. He has no plans, he pledges, for "rehabilitating" prisoners by surgery, drug therapy or "aversive treatment"—the sort of thing moviegoers saw in "A Clockwork Orange," when a young offender was made to feel severe pain in connection with thoughts of criminal acts.

Electroshock, if used at all, Dr. Groder says, will be limited to supervised treatment of mental patients, as in a civilian hospital, and will not be part of the research program. Nor will the rehabilitation experiments offer the kind of "rewards" that consist of putting a prisoner in painful or degrading circumstances, then gradually improving his environment as he becomes more docile and responsive to the authorities.

But if all that is true, and if the abuses alleged to have occurred at Vacaville, Patuxent and elsewhere are to be avoided at Butner, the question still remains whether Dr. Groder and the staff he is beginning to put together can really rehabilitate offenders in programs carried out within a prison institution—a task many students of the corrections system have come to consider impossible. The answer is by no means certain, but as will be seen in another article, Martin Groder thinks it's well worth a try.

PRISONS: CAN THEY BE REMADE?

(By Tom Wicker)

DURHAM, N.C.—Dr. Martin Groder, the young director of the new Federal Center for Correctional Research at Camp Butner, near here, looks on the traditional American prison system as a sort of last-ditch "welfare system" for young, healthy males—men who are ineligible for most regular welfare programs but who don't have the skills or the opportunity to earn a living.

"A guy like that who holds up a bank," Dr. Groder said in an interview, "knows one of three things can happen. He can make a score. He can get killed. Or he can be taken care of for awhile."

But not very well "taken care of"; Dr. Groder agrees with the conclusion of most students of American prisons that they do the prisoner no real good, and serve no purpose but his detention—and that at an average annual cost of about \$6,000 per prisoner. Dr. Groder sees no valid reason why all that should be the case.

"A significant percentage" of persons trapped into crime, and therefore in the dubious "welfare system" of prison, the psychiatrist argues, "don't like being trapped and are willing to confront the fact that

they are trapped. But when they turn to the larger society it does not contain a method for them to get untrapped."

It is his contention, however, that the trend toward "community corrections" now gaining currency is, as yet, not the answer. He does not believe enough is known about rehabilitation to permit any large-scale return of incarcerated men to community programs. "If we can get a top-notch rehabilitation program within the institution," he says, "a prisoner will be better off in it than wandering around the streets."

That seems to be the root idea of the Federal Center for Correctional Research, a campus-like facility now under construction at a cost of \$13.5-million, and designed to house 140 short-term mental patient-prisoners, and 200 others who will be in units carrying out experimental rehabilitation programs.

The mission of these units will be "to research particular programs and correctional hypotheses to provide usable rehabilitation models for other correctional institutions, and to train a new generation of correctional professionals." Many of the latter, if Dr. Groder's theories bear fruit, may be former prisoners; one of those with whom he worked at the Marion, Ill., Federal prison, for instance, is now head of a drug treatment program for the Georgia Correctional Department.

Other than to pledge that the new center will not use psychosurgery, massive drug dosages, electroshock and other dehumanizing practices, Dr. Groder is not precise about the "models" he hopes to work out. Some of the experiments will be directed toward developing useful institutional programs (which are practically non-existent now); others will be aimed at finding ways to follow released prisoners into the outside community and to help them adjust to it.

It is generally believed, for example, that if a released or paroled prisoner is "transplanted" to some community other than his own, he will have a harder time adjusting; Dr. Groder hopes to find out by experiment whether this would necessarily be true if there were good follow-up programs to assist the transplanted prisoner.

He hopes also that if promising institutional programs can be developed, they can give judges an alternative to "traditional incarceration." For some prisoners, he believes, the "college dormitory model" without overt psychiatric programs might prove beneficial; others might profit more from occupational therapy and training.

All of this is speculative and controversial, but Martin Groder is convinced it's necessary. "I could write you right now some of the papers you're going to be reading in the 1980's on the failure of community correctional programs unless there's more study, planning and evaluation," he said in the interview.

That may be a minority view. David Fogel, the progressive commissioner of corrections in Minnesota, told a group of foundation representatives recently that it was hopeless for them to invest their money in "improving" the institutional prison. Milton Rector of the National Council on Crime and Delinquency suggests that such programs as that planned for Camp Butner only further uproot and concentrate prisoners who ought to be treated in their own communities, under federally funded programs.

John Irwin, an ex-inmate now in the sociology department at San Francisco State College, fears that the Butner center may be primarily a response to "politically oriented troublemakers" and an effort to restore "tranquility in the prisons" by isolating such prisoners in an institution that will look good to the public.

The proof, of course, will be in the pudding; and a lot of eyes will be on the Federal Center for Correctional Research when it opens in early 1974.

NASA TESTING HYDROGEN IN
"GAS" TO CUT AUTO FUMES

HON. OLIN E. TEAGUE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. TEAGUE of Texas. Mr. Speaker, as this body well knows, this country is choking its citizens and fouling the air with poisonous auto-engine emissions. That fact stands out so vividly that Congress passed legislation that attempts to control auto-engine emissions.

Recently NASA has been testing a process that could sharply curtail those poisonous emissions, which was pointed out in a recent article in the New York Times, September 17, 1973, by Richard Witkin. I am reminded that this country's successes have been and will be achieved through scientific and technological research. I hope this distinguished body will join with me in commending NASA for their efforts. I commend Mr. Witkin's article to my fellow Members of Congress and the general public.

The article follows:

NASA TESTING HYDROGEN IN "GAS" TO CUT
AUTO FUMES

(By Richard Witkin)

A radical system aimed at meeting the legal limitation on auto-engine emissions is being developed by the National Aeronautics and Space Administration.

The concept involves the use of hydrogen as an additive to gasoline in modified versions of standard internal combustion engines. It has shown "promising" results in laboratory tests but will not help power an auto for another two months.

The development is being carried out in Pasadena, Calif. by the space agency's Jet Propulsion Laboratory, whose Ranger and Surveyor vehicles scouted the moon as a prelude to manned landings.

Engineers at the laboratory stressed that the work was in its early stages, with numerous difficult technical details to be worked out.

"It is too soon to talk about whether we really have a handle on being able to meet the Federal standards," said Henry Cotrill, project manager, in a telephone interview. "We're quite excited by the results so far, but we have a long way to go."

Starting today, representatives of the nation's major auto manufacturers will visit the laboratory for demonstrations of what has been accomplished.

Dr. William H. Pickering, the laboratory's director, said the companies had been invited "to assess the utility of this system with a view to the possibility that they might wish to work cooperatively with us."

The space agency has allocated \$600,000 for the first six months of the effort. Dr. Pickering estimated that it might take a total of \$4-million to \$5-million to meet the emissions standards now mandated for 1976 and 1977 under the Federal Clean Air Act.

A key component of the laboratory's system, based largely on research by an engineer named Jack Rupe, is a hydrogen generator that would be carried aboard the car. Mr. Cotrill predicted that a fully developed research vehicle able to meet the emissions standards could be running about two years from now.

"But, after that," he said, "it would have to be engineered for mass production. It wouldn't be ready yet for the little old lady from Pasadena."

The laboratory has bought two Chevrolet Impalas to be used as the research vehicles. The concept would be applicable to piston-engine airplanes as well as cars.

A prime advantage of the laboratory's approach, its proponents contend, is that it would meet auto-pollution requirements without the need for attaching catalytic devices to engine exhausts, as major Detroit companies are planning to do.

The auto capital's concentration on such catalytic devices has been viewed with reservations by technical authorities because of the devices' cost and because of doubts about their durability. Also, strong preferences for more innovative and efficient solutions have been expressed.

At least two other advantages are claimed for the laboratory's method. It would improve fuel consumption, and it could operate with low-grade petroleum or synthetics, not simply with conventional gasoline. The fuel shortages that threaten the nation underscore how important such advantages could be.

READY AVAILABILITY

Over the years, there has been much speculation and some work on the idea of using hydrogen, with its enormous power and ready availability, to power autos. In fact, hydrogen has been increasingly looked upon as the most promising long-term answer to the world's power needs as fossil fuels become exhausted.

The hydrogen-powered car, however, has several obvious drawbacks.

For one thing, hydrogen can be very dangerous because of its extreme volatility. It takes up a great amount of space in gaseous form. And in much more compact liquid form, it must be kept at minus 423 degrees Fahrenheit. This requires expensive tankage that would have a big impact on auto design and on service stations.

The laboratory's concept aims to circumvent these complications in two ways: by perfecting an on-board generator to produce hydrogen as needed, and by using hydrogen not as the main auto fuel but simply as an additive.

How would the hydrogen be generated? First, regular gasoline and air would be ignited in the generator. The mix would burn constantly, much like the mixture in the combustor of a jet engine. Next, a carefully measured amount of water and more gasoline would be injected. The reaction, under the extreme heat from the burner, would produce hydrogen, carbon monoxide, and some inert products.

Why would the use of this hydrogen as an additive cut down on exhaust pollutants? The answer has to do with the fact that hydrogen will burn at much leaner mixtures than will gasoline. A lean mixture is one in which the ratio of fuel to oxidizing air is relatively small.

WATER VAPOR

The combustion of lean mixtures produces lower temperature. That in turn cuts the production of oxides of nitrogen, the most difficult of the three main auto pollutants to curtail (the others are hydrocarbons and carbon monoxide). Tests show that the hydrogen fuel burns so completely that its exhaust products are nearly all water vapor and other inert components.

When idling, the auto engine would be run entirely on the output of the hydrogen generator. In city-street driving, where comparatively little engine power is needed, the proportion of hydrogen to regular gas would be relatively high.

Why not use the hydrogen gas all by itself? "Hydrogen is not that easy to generate," says Mr. Cotrill. Of the products put out by the hydrogen generator, only 20 to 22 percent will be hydrogen. Furthermore hydrogen has a habit of causing engine knocks at high power levels.

CUBAN EXILES IN SPAIN

HON. C. W. BILL YOUNG

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. YOUNG of Florida. Mr. Speaker, since the Justice Department is currently considering the situation surrounding those Cuban exiles in Spain who are awaiting their turn to enter the United States, I think it relevant that my colleagues become aware of the position taken by the Florida House of Representatives on this issue. I am, therefore, inserting the full text of House Memorial 95 which asks for the relief of those Cuban exiles in Spain.

The memorial follows:

MEMORIAL

HM 95—A memorial to the congress of the United States to provide for the giving of credit to the Cuban citizens in Spain who have applied for entry into the United States to compensate for the initial waiting period in Cuba.

Whereas, the country of Cuba was taken over through communist tyranny and many Cuban citizens believing in democracy and the free enterprise system, left their properties and the fruits of their life's work and came to the United States, following in the footsteps of the ancestors of millions of Americans who came to this country because of religious and political injustices;

Whereas, many Cuban-American citizens have loved ones in Cuba who formally made known to an unfriendly Cuban government their wishes to come to the United States;

Whereas, as a result those Cubans suffered the loss of substantially all of their property and have been required to wait in a destitute condition for more than two (2) years in order to leave Cuba;

Whereas, many Cubans who have waited in Cuba without the benefit of their property for periods in excess of two (2) years for the right to leave the country and have gone to Spain where they are again required to wait for a period of over two (2) years before being permitted to come to the United States to rejoin their loved ones;

Whereas, there are now more than 30,000 Cuban citizens in Spain awaiting their turn to come to the United States and more than 15,000 are encountering overwhelming difficulties in obtaining adequate food, clothing and shelter, being without property in a foreign country;

Whereas, the Cuban people in the United States have been contributing money, clothing, etc. from private sources to the Cubans in Spain;

Whereas, the total wait time, including the waiting period in Cuba and the additional period in Spain, far exceeds that of other people desiring to come to the United States, which is compounded by the requirement of the Cuban government that they give up substantially all of the property at the very beginning of this prolonged waiting period, has caused an overwhelming burden upon these people;

Now, therefore, Be It Resolved by the Legislature of the State of Florida:

That the Congress of the United States is hereby requested to provide for the giving of credit to the Cubans in Spain who have applied for entry into the United States to compensate for the initial waiting period in Cuba, so that these people are not penalized by a longer waiting period than the applicants of other countries seeking entry into the United States.

Be it further resolved that copies of this memorial be dispatched to the president of the United States, to the president of the

United States Senate, to the Speaker of the United States House of Representatives, and to each of the Florida delegation to the United States Congress.

PRESIDENT CONTINUES CONTROL OF NATIONAL GUARD UNDER HOME RULE

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, the commanding general of the D.C. National Guard has now given written assurance that the President will continue his ability to use the local guard in controlling civil disturbance after passage of H.R. 9682, the D.C. self-government bill. The commanding general is at present appointed by the President, and will continue to be appointed by the President under H.R. 9682, section 602(b).

ERRONEOUS ASSUMPTION IN MINORITY VIEWS, SAYS GENERAL

Gen. Charles L. Southward states that:

The concern expressed by the dissenting members of the Committee is more apparent than real . . . it is based on (an) erroneous assumption.

As the general explains,

The method of utilizing the D.C. National Guard that has been followed in all instances where the Guard has been employed to assist D.C. civil authorities is to order the D.C. Guard to perform duty under the provisions of Section 39-602, D.C. Code.

The commanding general issues the order by authority of the Under Secretary of the Army and hence under the President.

The minority in the committee report erroneously assume that the only way the guard could be used by the President is after a request by the Mayor under section 39-603, D.C. Code.

General Southward said:

This procedure has not been utilized in any of the instances where the D.C. National Guard has been employed in support of the local civil authorities, commencing with "the March on Washington" in 1963.

MAYOR'S REQUEST NOT NEEDED

As General Southward states:

The Mayor's request for assistance is not now needed prior to the President's use of the National Guard within the District in militia status, and will not be required after passage of H.R. 9682.

This is another example of the careful way in which the bill has been drafted to protect the Federal interest and maintain the integrity, safety and security of the national Government in the Nation's capital. The texts of the general's letter and memorandum follow.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD,
Washington, D.C., October 4, 1973.

Hon. Brock Adams,
House of Representatives,
Washington, D.C.

DEAR MR. ADAMS: This letter and the accompanying legal memorandum is submitted pursuant to the request from Miss Anne Darnelle of your staff to Colonel James C. Hise, of my Headquarters, that we provide the

House Committee on the District of Columbia with our opinion as to the effect which passage of H.R. 9682 would have on the ability of the President to utilize the District of Columbia National Guard in controlling civil disturbance activities within the District absent an express request from the Mayor for such assistance.

I am of the opinion that passage of H.R. 9682 would have no limiting effect on the capability of the D.C. National Guard to respond to the call or order of the President for civil disturbance control duty within the District of Columbia. As indicated in the attached memorandum, and for the reasons set forth therein, the D.C. National Guard has not been ordered to duty under Section 39-603 on any of the occasions subsequent to 1963 where it has been utilized to assist the civil authorities of the District of Columbia in controlling civil disturbances.

I trust that this submission will be of assistance to the Committee in its consideration of H.R. 9682.

Sincerely,

CHARLES L. SOUTHWARD,
Major General, ARNG,
Commanding General.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA NATIONAL GUARD,
Washington, D.C., Oct. 4, 1973.

Memorandum for: Commanding General,
District of Columbia National Guard

1. This memorandum is submitted pursuant to a request from Miss Anne Darnelle of Congressman Brock Adams' staff to me that we furnish the Committee on the District of Columbia with our opinion concerning the effect which passage of H.R. 9682 would have on the availability of the D.C. National Guard for duty in support of the civil authorities of the District of Columbia in the absence of an express request from the Mayor for such assistance.

2. I am aware of the dissenting views expressed at page 126 of the House Report on H.R. 9682 to the effect that should this bill be passed by the Congress " . . . the President could not respond to the need for militia support of local government without the express request of the locally elected Mayor." Section 39-603 of the D.C. Code is cited as the authority for this statement. I believe that the concern expressed by the dissenting members of the Committee is more apparent than real, and that it is based on the erroneous assumption that the prior use of the D.C. National Guard in such instances has been pursuant to Section 39-603, D.C. Code.

3. In order to fully appreciate the question involved, one must first understand the development of the Supervision and Control of the National Guard of the District of Columbia, which is based on existing law as affected by Presidential Executive Orders and Secretary of Defense Memoranda, and other regulatory type directives. Under existing law, the President is the Commander-in-Chief of the D.C. National Guard (39-112, D.C. Code) and as such is responsible for the administration of the D.C. National Guard affairs. The President, alone, has the authority to appoint the Commanding General of the District of Columbia National Guard (39-201, D.C. Code).

4. The President has, since 1949, delegated the administration of the D.C. National Guard affairs to the Department of Defense by Executive Order, the most recent and currently applicable one being Executive Order No. 11485, dated October 1, 1969 (copy attached). Under authority of para. 4 of this Executive Order, the Secretary of Defense has further delegated to the Secretary of the Army to act for him in matters pertaining to the Army National Guard and to the Secretary of the Air Force to act for him in matters pertaining to the Air National Guard.

5. As an exception to the above delegations the Secretary of Defense has delegated to the Secretary of the Army authority to command, through the Commanding General of the National Guard, all operations of the Army and Air National Guard elements of the D.C. National Guard when it is used in militia status to aid civil authorities. The Secretary of the Army, after consultation with the Secretary of Defense and subject to the direction of the President as Commander-in-Chief, may order out the National Guard under title 39 of the District of Columbia Code to aid the civil authorities of the District of Columbia. This latter authority has been further delegated to the Under Secretary of the Army.

6. The Executive Order creates a military chain of command running from the President as Commander-in-Chief of the D.C. National Guard, through the Secretary of Defense and his designees within the Department of Defense to the Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard. The Commanding General of the D.C. National Guard is authorized direct access to the Under Secretary of the Army; and the Secretary of the Army and Under Secretary of the Army, subject to the supervision of the Secretary of Defense, have controlled the assembly and employment of the Guard in civil disturbance missions.

7. With this background as to the legal basis for the supervision and control of the D.C. National Guard we can now turn to the various methods of utilizing the National Guard. There are three possible methods of utilizing the D.C. National Guard in the type of situation with which we are concerned in this memorandum:

a. The President can call the Army and Air National Guard into active Federal service pursuant to sections 3500 and 8500, title 10, U.S. Code, whenever there is a rebellion or danger of a rebellion against the authority of the Government of the United States or whenever the President is unable with the regular forces to execute the laws of the United States. The President may also call the National Guard into Federal active service pursuant to chapter 15, title 10, U.S. Code. This is the means employed to bring the D.C. National Guard into Federal active service during the riots which followed the death of Dr. King in April, 1968. (See attached copy of E.O. 11403, dtd April 9, 1968). This is the only instance, going back to the original "March on Washington" in 1963, where the D.C. National Guard was utilized in a Federal active duty status in connection with civil disturbance control.

b. Another method of utilizing the D.C. National Guard is in its militia status under Section 39-603, D.C. Code. This procedure has not been utilized in any of the instances where the D.C. National Guard has been employed in support of the local civil authorities, commencing with the "March on Washington" in 1963. There are several reasons why this Section has not been used:

(1) There has never been any funds in the District of Columbia budget to pay for the Guard on duty under this section;

(2) If employed under this section enlisted Guardsmen receive two days pay for each day of duty (See Section 39-801, D.C. Code).

(3) No provision in D.C. Code for benefits to Guardsmen or dependents in event of Guardsman injury or death on duty.

(4) Requires "tumult, riot, mob," which would be too late to alert and mobilize the Guard for effective service.

c. The third method of utilizing the D.C. National Guard and the one that has been followed in all instances where the Guard has been employed to assist D.C. civil authorities is to order the D.C. Guard to perform duty under the provision of Section 39-602, D.C. Code, which gives the Commanding General the authority to " . . .

prescribe such stated drills and parades as he may deem necessary for the instruction of the National Guard, and may order out any portion of the National Guard for such drills, inspections, parades, escort, or other duties, as he may deem proper." [emphasis added]. Action under this Section, as a matter of law, requires only the order of the Commanding General. As a practical matter the Commanding General would consult with the Chief of Police and Mayor, and would be governed by instructions of the Under Secretary of the Army. This is the fastest and least complicated means of assembling and using the National Guard. Since no provision is made in the D.C. Code for payment of Guardsmen for this type of duty, the Commanding General also designates the duty as a unit training period under provisions of Section 502 of title 32, U.S. Code. This results in Federal pay to the Guardsmen at the rate of two drills per day of duty. Other advantages of using this procedure is that the individual Guardsmen are entitled to Federal benefits if injured or killed while in drill status under 32 U.S.C. 502.

8. As can be seen from the above discussion, it is difficult to see how H.R. 9682 could affect the utilization of the National Guard by the President in situations where the Mayor refuses to make a request, since we have not utilized Section 36-603, D.C. Code in the recent past, and in view of the language of Title VI of H.R. 9682 which at Section 602 (b) specifies that nothing in the bill shall be construed as vesting in the District Government any greater authority over the National Guard of the District of Columbia than was vested in the Commissioner prior to the effective date of Title VI of the bill. The Mayor's request for assistance is not now needed prior to the President's use of the National Guard within the District in militia status, and will not be required after passage of H.R. 9682.

9. I should also like to point out that even should it be decided to use Section 39-603, D.C. Code, and the locally elected Mayor refuses to cooperate with the President (a possibility suggested in the dissenting report) the President will still have an appointed official within the District—the United States Marshal who also is authorized to request the Commander-in-Chief to order out the National Guard.

JAMES C. HISE,
Colonel, DCANG, Staff Judge Advocate.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS—No. 11485

[October 3, 1969, 34 F.R. 15411; October 4, 1969, 34 F.R. 15443]

SUPERVISION AND CONTROL OF THE NATIONAL GUARD OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

By virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States and Commander-in-Chief of the Armed Forces of the United States and the National Guard of the District of Columbia under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including section 6 of the Act of March 1, 1889, 25 Stat. 773 (District of Columbia Code, sec. 39-112), and section 110 of title 32⁶⁶ and section 301 of title 3⁶⁷ of the United States Code, it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Defense, except as provided in section 3, is authorized and directed to supervise, administer and control the Army National Guard and the Air National Guard of the District of Columbia (hereinafter "National Guard") while in militia status. The Commanding General of the National Guard shall report to the Secretary of Defense or to an official of the Department of Defense designated by the Secretary on all matters pertaining to the National Guard.

Through the Commanding General, the Secretary of Defense shall command the military operations, including training, parades and other duty, of the National Guard while in militia status. Subject to the direction of the President as Commander-in-Chief, the Secretary may order out the National Guard under title 39 of the District of Columbia Code to aid the civil authorities of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 2. The Attorney General is responsible for: (1) advising the President with respect to the alternatives available pursuant to law for the use of the National Guard to aid the civil authorities of the District of Columbia; and (2) for establishing after consultation with the Secretary of Defense law enforcement policies to be observed by the military forces in the event the National Guard is used in its militia status to aid civil authorities of the District of Columbia.

Sec. 3. The Commanding General and the Adjutant General of the National Guard will be appointed by the President. The Secretary of Defense, after consultation with the Attorney General, shall at such times as may be appropriate submit to the President recommendations with respect to such appointments.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of Defense and the Attorney General are authorized to delegate to subordinate officials of their respective Departments any of the authority conferred upon them by this order.

Sec. 5. Executive Order No. 10030 of January 26, 1949,⁶⁸ is hereby superseded.

RICHARD NIXON.

THE WHITE HOUSE, October 1, 1969.

EXECUTIVE ORDERS—No. 11403

[April 9, 1968, 33 F.R. 5501]

PROVIDING FOR THE RESTORATION OF LAW AND ORDER IN THE WASHINGTON METROPOLITAN AREA

Whereas I have today issued Proclamation No. 3840, calling upon persons engaged in acts of violence and disorder in the Washington metropolitan area to cease and desist therefrom and to disperse and retire peaceably forthwith; and

Whereas the conditions of domestic violence and disorder described therein continue, and the persons engaging in such acts of violence have not dispersed:

Now, therefore, by virtue of the authority vested in me as President of the United States and Commander in Chief of the Armed Forces under the Constitution and laws of the United States, including Chapter 15 of Title 10 of the United States Codes⁶⁹ and Section 301 of Title 3 of the United States Code,⁷⁰ and by virtue of the authority vested in me as commander-in-chief of the militia of the District of Columbia by the Act of March 1, 1889, as amended (D.C. Code, Title 39), it is hereby ordered as follows:

Section 1. The Secretary of Defense is authorized and directed to take all appropriate steps to disperse all persons engaged in the acts of violence described in the proclamation, to restore law and order, and to see that the property, personnel and functions of the Federal Government, of embassies of foreign governments, and of international organizations in the Washington metropolitan area are protected against violence or other interference.

Sec. 2. In carrying out the provisions of Section 1, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use such of the Armed Forces of the United States as he may deem necessary.

Sec. 3. (a) The Secretary of Defense is hereby authorized and directed to call into the active military service of the United States, as he may deem appropriate to carry out the purposes of this order, units or mem-

bers of the Army National Guard and of the Air National Guard to serve in the active military service of the United States for an indefinite period and until relieved by appropriate orders. Units or members may be relieved subject to recall at the discretion of the Secretary of Defense. In carrying out the provisions of Section 1, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to use units and members called or recalled into the active military service of the United States pursuant to this section.

(b) In addition, in carrying out the provisions of Section 1, the Secretary of Defense is authorized to exercise any of the powers vested in me by law as commander-in-chief of the militia of the District of Columbia during such time as any units or members of the Army National Guard or Air National Guard of the District shall not have been called into the active military service of the United States.

Sec. 4. The Secretary of Defense is authorized to delegate to one or more of the Secretaries of the military Departments any of the authority conferred upon him by this order.

LYNDON B. JOHNSON.

The WHITE HOUSE, April 5, 1968.

THE 4-H CLUB SKILLS

HON. ELLA T. GRASSO

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mrs. GRASSO. Mr. Speaker, across the Nation young people are gaining knowledge, understanding and practical skills through activities of the 4-H Clubs.

Over 4 million youngsters, ranging in age from 9 to 19, participate in the clubs' various projects. These can be traditional 4-H activities such as raising a prize steer or raising blue-ribbon squash. They may also include the building of a park or the restoration of a historical building.

We commemorate National 4-H Week from October 1-7 in recognition of the contributions of 4-H clubs in community service and in providing positive, constructive experiences for so many young men and women.

The 4-H idea began in rural America in the early 1900's with agricultural clubs for farm youth. In 1914 Congress created the Cooperative Extension Service which included a "learn by doing" program to channel the practical knowledge from land-grant colleges into surrounding communities.

The 4-H Club, with its H's representing Head, Heart, Hand, and Health, has always emphasized youth leadership, competition, and achievement. Today, clubs are adapting their programs to the problems and lifestyles of the suburbs and innercity as well as to the farm. Each 4-H member selects one or more projects which vary according to the geographical region. In rural areas members become involved in conservation, forestry, farm management, or livestock. City and suburban projects include environmental concerns, community service, or electric and automotive projects.

In addition to its programs in the United States, the 4-H offers rich op-

⁶⁶ 32 U.S.C.A. § 110.

⁶⁷ 3 U.S.C.A. § 301.

⁶⁸ 1949 U.S. Code Cong. Service p. 2651.

opportunities for international understanding. The Farm Youth Exchange, which sends American students abroad and brings many foreign students to this country, has already involved over 5,000 students. The organization also trains youth who want to use their special technical talents to aid developing countries.

The 4-H clubs have continued to meet the changing needs of the youth of this Nation with programs designed to broaden their outlook and experience. The practical knowledge that is gained will be helpful in their personal development and future careers.

During 4-H Week, I would like to commend 4-H members and the 400,000 volunteer adult members who assist the youngsters in accomplishing meaningful club projects. It is my hope that 4-H clubs will continue to provide constructive guidance to our youth in the years ahead.

BACKGROUND PAPER ON FAMILY WELFARE PROGRAM

HON. OGDEN R. REID

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. REID. Mr. Speaker, on Friday, September 28, a staff briefing was held on the new social service regulations issued September 10 by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. As a followup to this meeting, I would like to submit a background paper on the family welfare program and social services, prepared by Mr. William G. Lunsford, Washington Office Director of the Child Welfare League of America. I hope that this paper will serve to clarify many of the questions raised by this complex but vitally important issue:

BACKGROUND INFORMATION ON THE FAMILY WELFARE PROGRAM AND SOCIAL SERVICES

(By William G. Lunsford)

Public assistance programs, more commonly known as welfare, for which the Federal government makes a financial contribution, are provided for by the Social Security Act. Titles I, IV, VI, X, XIV, XVI and XIX of the Social Security Act contain the public assistance provisions for the various categories. The following shows the category covered by each title:

Title I—Old Age Assistance (OAA) and Medical Assistance for the Aged (Medicare).

Title IV—Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Title VI—Services to the Aged, Blind and Disabled.

Title X—Aid to the Blind (AB).

Title XIV—Aid to the Permanent and Totally Disabled (APTD).

Title XVI—Supplementary Security Income for the Aged, Blind and Disabled (SSI).

Title XIX—Medical Assistance (Medicaid).

All of the above programs are a combination of Federal and State, or Federal, State and local funding with the exception of the SSI program. As of January 1, 1974, the SSI program (Title XVI) will replace the AB, APTD, and OAA programs, with the exception of Medicare under Title I. The SSI program will be 100% federally funded. Title VI will replace service programs for the aged, blind, and disabled, and will be on a 75-25 matching basis.

This background paper will concentrate on the AFDC program (Title IV). For additional information on the other programs contact any of the following sources of information:

All welfare programs: American Public Welfare Association, 1660 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

National Governors Conference, 150 Seventeenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

National Association of Social Workers, 600 Southern Building, 15th and H Streets N.W., Washington, D.C. 20005.

Programs for the aged: National Council on the Aging, 1828 L Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Programs for the handicapped: National Association for Retarded Children, R.D. #1, Box 303A, Hampton, New Jersey 08827.

Title IV of the Social Security Act is subdivided into three parts:

Part A—Aid to Families with Dependent Children (AFDC).

Part B—Child Welfare Services (CWS).

Part C—Work Incentive Program (WIN).

The cash assistance and social services provisions for families are contained in Part A.

The AFDC program is a combination of Federal-State, and Federal-State and local funding. Overall administrative responsibility for the program rests with the Social Rehabilitation Service (SRS) within the Department of Health, Education and Welfare. The actual administration at the State and local level rests with the State welfare department. In many instances the local program is administered by the County Welfare Board.

In order to receive a Federal financial contribution for public assistance programs the State must file and have approved by HEW a plan for the administration of the program. The State plan must provide for 1) statewide application of the plan; 2) designation of a single agency for administration; 3) fair hearings for those persons denied assistance; 4) uniform procedures for determining eligibility; 5) the delivery of family services to maintain and strengthen family life, attain and retain capability for self-support and care, and to foster child development; 6) family planning, foster care, and protective services for neglected and abused children; 7) collection of child support, and determination of paternity; and 8) mandatory registration of all eligible adults for jobs or job training.

AFDC cash assistance is made to a family with one or more needy children under age eighteen (age twenty-one if attending school) who has been deprived of paternal support or care by reason of the death, continued absence from the home, or physical or mental incapacity of a parent. The typical AFDC family consists of a mother and three children. The definition of the child on whose behalf AFDC payments are made means a family does not qualify if both parents are in the home. In twenty-four States a separate program AFDC-U (Aid to Families with Dependent Children with Unemployed Fathers) does provide cash assistance, if the father is in the home and unemployed.

In determining eligibility the State disregards the earned income of any students, and the first \$30 of earned income and $\frac{1}{3}$ of the remaining income for all adult applicants. Although the amount of income to be disregarded in determining eligibility is standardized for all States, each State determines its own standard of need. The standard of need is the amount of income beneath which families are considered to be eligible for public assistance. The standard of need ranges from \$2208 per year (184/month) for a family of four in North Carolina to \$4800 per year (\$400/month) for a family of four in Alaska (the typical AFDC family consists of four persons, a mother and three children). States are not required to pay 100%

of their standard of need. July 1972 statistics from HEW indicated thirty-two States paid 100% while other States ranged down to a low percentage of 22% of need paid in Mississippi. The Social Security Act requires the States to revise their standard of need annually to account for changes in the cost of living.

Once eligibility for public assistance is determined the net income (after deducting the disregards) is subtracted from the payment standard to determine the actual payment to be received. In thirty-one States the payment standard is the same as the standard of need. In nineteen States the payment standard is the same as the maximum payment which a family may receive. In Wyoming the standard of need, the payment standard, and the maximum payment level are all different (see attached chart).

In addition to the cash assistance offered to AFDC recipients, the Social Security Act also mandates the States to provide social services to current, past, and potential AFDC recipients to attain and retain capability for self-support and care, and in order to maintain and strengthen family life and to foster child development. In addition to the mandatory services to be provided to AFDC recipients (family planning, foster care, protective services for neglected and abused children, and day care in order to allow an adult recipient to work or take job training), the Secretary of HEW through regulations is allowed to specify other mandatory services to be offered recipients, and optional services which may be offered to past and potential recipients. The Secretary is authorized to set time limited definitions for past and potential recipients.

In addition to the four mandated services provided for in the Social Security Act itself, the current regulations for Title IV-A social services also requires the States to provide a number of additional services. The State at its option, may provide any of the mandatory services to past and potential AFDC recipients, as well as other services listed as optional, which may be offered to current, past, and potential recipients. The regulations currently in effect for Title IV-A defines a past recipient as a person who has received AFDC cash assistance within the preceding two years, and a potential recipient as a person likely to become a recipient of AFDC cash assistance within the next five years.

The Social Security Act stipulates that the Federal government will pay 75% of the cost of services offered under Title IV-A. Until October 18, 1972 when a ceiling of \$2.5 billion was placed on social services spending, the Federal government provided three dollars for every one dollar which the State spent on social services, without limitation on the number of dollars the Federal government would match. The amendment to the General Revenue Sharing Act which included the \$2.5 billion ceiling, also stipulated 90% of the funds spent on social services had to be spent on services to current AFDC recipients, with the exemption of funds spent for family planning, foster care, and child care (the 90-10 provision). This provision meant that past and potential recipients would no longer be eligible to receive many of the services they had received prior to the limitation.

Pursuant to the passage of the ceiling and the 90-10 limitation, HEW issued new regulations for Title IV-A programs on February 16, 1973. The proposed regulations which were to take effect on May 1st were so restrictive they would have made it impossible for the States to spend any more than \$1.8 billion of the \$2.5 billion which was allocated to them. Reacting to the opposition of thousands of citizens, State and local government officials, and members of Congress, HEW withdrew its regulations, and sought to revise them.

A new set of regulations were issued on

May 1, 1973, slated to become effective July 1, 1973. The May 1st regulations did not prove to be any less restrictive than the February 16th regulations. The States still would have been permitted to only spend an estimated \$1.8 billion of the \$2.5 billion allocated for social service programs. The effect of the February 16th and May 1st regulations was to increase tremendously the possibility that large numbers of persons who were not AFDC recipients would be forced onto the welfare rolls due to the withdrawal of services which prevented their dependency.

The Senate Finance Committee held hearings on the effect of the regulations early in May and the legislative machinery to block the effective date of the May 1st regulations was put into motion. The Finance Committee approved an amendment to the Debt Ceiling Limitation to delay the effective date of the regulations for six months until January 1, 1974. The House-Senate Conference Committee on the Debt Ceiling Bill approved a four month delay in the effective date of regulations until November 1, 1973. A vote in the House declared the delaying amendment not germane to the Debt Ceiling Bill, so the delaying amendment was attached to the Renegotiation Act and passed by the Congress on June 30th. The amendment delayed the effective date of the social services regulations until November 1st, and stipulated HEW could issue and implement new regulations prior to that date if a majority of the members of the House Ways and Means Committee and the Senate Finance Committee approved the revised regulations.

On September 10, 1973 HEW published new regulations which sought to meet the objections raised by the members of Congress. The September 10th revisions are still extremely rigid in their eligibility requirements (in some respects more so than the February 16th and May 1st regulations). The HEW estimate is that States still would only be able to spend \$1.8 billion of the \$2.5 billion allocated. The regulations are slated to become effective on November 1st.

HEW's social services regulations, as revised on September 10th contain the following provisions:

1. To be eligible for services, other than day care, family income must be less than 150% of the State payment standard for

AFDC, after \$60 income is disregarded. To be eligible for day care services family income must be less than 250% of the State payment standard for AFDC, and within the income limits provided for in a State fee schedule.

2. Past recipients are defined as those persons who have received cash assistance in the past three months, and potential recipients are those persons who have a problem, if not ameliorated by the provision of services will lead to dependency upon AFDC cash assistance within six months.

3. Services may be provided in order to achieve the following goals: self-support and self-sufficiency, and in the case of services provided to AFDC recipients to "strengthen family life" where a child may be neglected or abused.

4. The mandatory services for AFDC recipients are those required by the Social Security Act: foster care, family planning; protective services for neglected and abused children, and day care to allow a parent to work or receive job training.

5. The list of optional services has been greatly narrowed.

The effect of the social services regulations on services to children is as follows:

1. The income eligibility level for services, other than day care is so low only those persons who actually qualify for AFDC cash assistance will qualify for services.

2. There are no guidelines for the fee schedule which States could set for day care services. The fee schedules may be set so high as to make the receipt of day care services impossible for low income families.

3. The standards to be applied to day care are vague. Reference to the 1968 Federal Interagency Day Care Requirements has been eliminated. The requirement in the current regulation in effect which requires that State standards for in-home day care and group home day care should be in reasonable compliance with the standards of national day care standard setting organizations has been eliminated.

4. Potential recipients may not be able to receive foster care and protective services for neglected and abused children due to the fact the need for foster care and protective services are not problems which

would lead to dependency within six months.

5. The regulations currently in effect make it possible for adoption services to be provided under the foster care provisions. HEW's regulations have no such provision.

Since it is clear after two sets of revisions that HEW is not going to issue a set of regulations to correct the problems created by their regulations, new legislation will provide the only remedy. Additionally the 90-10 provision needs to be revised to add protective services for neglected and abused children to the list of services exempt from the requirement, since child neglect and abuse is a problem not limited to children in the AFDC category.

A broad coalition of national organizations is seeking the passage of legislation which would provide the States with the needed flexibility in determining eligibility for services, and the services to be offered, in order that the full \$2.5 billion may be spent for social services programs. The prime sponsor of the legislation is Senator Walter F. Mondale along with 34 other Senators. The legislation was introduced today, October 3, 1973, and will be given active consideration during the Senate Finance Committee's work on the House passed bill H.R. 3315, "The Technical and Conforming Amendments to H.R. 1."

For more detailed information on the social services regulations and their impact see the following source material:

Social Services Regulations, Hearings before the Senate Finance Committee, May 8, 15, 16, 17, 1973, Part 1 of 2 Parts, Senate Finance Committee.

Testimony of the Child Welfare League of America before the Senate Finance Committee and CWLA Comments on September Revision of HEW's Social Services Regulations, both available from the Child Welfare League of America, Washington Office, 1145-19th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

Memoranda relating to HEW's social services regulations, Washington Research Project, 1763 R Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20009.

National Journal Reports, August 4, 1973, Vol. 5, No. 31, pages 1132-1137.

October 3, 1973.

TABLE 2.—FULL STANDARD, PAYMENT STANDARD, PAYMENT LEVEL—AFDC FAMILY OF 4; ELIGIBILITY LEVEL FOR DAY CARE SERVICES

Totals	Full standard* (monthly)	Payment standard (monthly)	Maximum payment (monthly)	150 percent of payment standard** (annually)	233 1/3 percent of payment standard (annually)	Totals	Full standard* (monthly)	Payment standard (monthly)	Maximum payment (monthly)	150 percent of payment standard** (annually)	233 1/3 percent of payment standard (annually)
1. Alabama.....	230	97	97	1,746	2,716	29. Nevada.....	320	176	176	3,168	4,928
2. Alaska.....	400	400	375	7,200	11,200	30. New Hampshire.....	294	294	294	5,292	8,232
3. Arizona.....	282	282	184	5,070	7,896	31. New Jersey.....	324	324	324	5,832	9,072
4. Arkansas.....	229	229	111	4,122	6,412	32. New Mexico.....	203	203	179	3,654	5,684
5. California.....	314	314	280	5,682	8,792	33. New York.....	336	336	313	6,048	9,408
6. Colorado.....	242	242	242	4,356	6,776	34. North Carolina.....	184	159	159	2,859	4,447
7. Connecticut.....	338	338	338	6,084	9,464	35. North Dakota.....	300	300	300	5,400	8,400
8. Delaware.....	287	287	152	5,167	8,039	36. Ohio.....	258	200	200	3,600	5,600
9. District of Columbia.....	318	239	239	4,382	6,692	37. Oklahoma.....	222	189	189	3,402	5,292
10. Florida.....	223	223	144	4,014	6,244	38. Oregon.....	333	267	267	4,806	7,476
11. Georgia.....	227	227	149	4,086	6,356	39. Pennsylvania.....	313	313	313	5,634	8,764
12. Hawaii.....	334	334	334	6,012	9,352	40. Rhode Island.....	263	263	263	4,734	7,364
13. Idaho.....	314	282	282	5,076	7,896	41. South Carolina.....	208	208	104	3,744	5,824
14. Illinois.....	272	272	272	4,896	7,616	42. South Dakota.....	300	285	285	5,130	7,980
15. Indiana.....	363	363	205	6,534	10,164	43. Tennessee.....	217	217	132	3,906	6,076
16. Iowa.....	300	300	243	5,400	8,400	44. Texas.....	197	148	148	2,664	4,144
17. Kansas.....	343	322	322	5,796	9,016	45. Utah.....	322	235	235	4,230	6,380
18. Kentucky.....	234	234	171	4,212	6,552	46. Vermont.....	335	335	335	6,030	9,380
19. Louisiana.....	193	108	108	1,944	3,024	47. Virginia.....	279	261	261	4,698	7,308
20. Maine.....	349	349	168	6,282	9,772	48. Washington.....	306	284	294	5,292	8,232
21. Maryland.....	311	200	200	3,600	5,600	49. West Virginia.....	265	138	138	2,484	5,796
22. Massachusetts.....	349	349	349	6,282	9,772	50. Wisconsin.....	312	302	302	5,436	8,456
23. Michigan.....	361	361	361	6,498	10,108	51. Wyoming.....	283	260	227	4,680	7,279
24. Minnesota.....	339	339	339	6,102	9,492	52. American Samoa.....					
25. Mississippi.....	277	277	60	4,986	7,756	53. Guam.....					
26. Missouri.....	303	303	130	5,454	8,484	54. Puerto Rico.....					
27. Montana.....	225	206	206	3,708	5,768	55. Trust Territory.....					
28. Nebraska.....	307	307	226	5,526	8,596	56. Virgin Islands.....					

*Standard of need.

**Add \$720 for income eligibility under Sept. 10 regulations.

Source: Child Welfare League of America, Inc.

FDA'S EIGHT RATS

HON. PHILIP M. CRANE

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. CRANE. Mr. Speaker, it is becoming clear to more and more Americans concerned with the level of medical care and the introduction of new drugs that the Food and Drug Administration is hindering, and not helping, the health of the American people.

There is an increasing tendency for government agencies to say "No" to the introduction of a new drug if they have any doubts at all, whether or not such doubts are well founded on a scientific basis.

Dr. Wylie Gibbs, executive director of the Australian Pharmaceutical Manufacturers Association, said this in an address to new graduates of the Victorian College of Pharmacy:

There is everywhere a trend for Government to assume the responsibilities for deciding which new drug is to be accepted for use and which one is to be rejected. Over every person who is required to participate in this decision making there hangs the shadow of another possible thalidomide disaster. The consequence of this is that there is an increasing tendency for government agencies to say "No."

Turning to the situation in the United States, Dr. Gibbs stated that,

I was recently informed that in America research into a new and promising substance, which had survived all the many hurdles which attend therapeutic trials, was stopped even though it showed great promise. The reason for this was that the FDA required extensive intravenous studies to be carried out on newborn rats. . . . Such a request, of course, exceeded the technical capacity of the company—at least to carry out the request at a cost which would not bankrupt it. The company is one of the most highly sophisticated and developed in the world.

Now we learn that cyclamates may have been withdrawn from the market for no valid reason.

The Wall Street Journal noted that,

Those eight rats who developed bladder cancer after feeding on high dosages of cyclamate artificial sweetener would have been pleased to read . . . the other day that cyclamates may have had nothing to do with their demise.

A German scientist, Dr. Dieter Schmahl, fed even higher doses of cyclamates to 832 rats over a much longer period of time. He found bladder cancer in only one of them, one that had received the lowest dosage, and concluded that the tumor was produced by an unrelated bladder condition.

The Journal cautions that readers should not:

Expect to find cyclamates back on the supermarket shelves right away, however. The FDA has those eight rats on its hands.

The folly of bureaucratic control of new drugs is becoming greater as examples such as this arise.

I wish to share with my colleagues the editorial, "FDA's Eight Rats," which appeared in the Wall Street Journal of July 16, 1973, and insert it into the RECORD at this time.

FDA'S EIGHT RATS

Those eight rats who developed bladder cancer after feeding on high dosages of cyclamate artificial sweeteners would have been pleased to read on our front page the other day that cyclamates may have had nothing to do with their demise. The \$300 million diet soft-drink industry should also be gratified that it probably was not contributing to the debilitation of the soft-drinking population before 1969, the year the rats died and the Food and Drug Administration banned the sweetener.

The eight who died were among 80 given stiff shots of cyclamates by a private U.S. research organization. Now it seems a German scientist, Dr. Dieter Schmahl of the Cancer Research Center at Heidelberg University, fed even higher doses of cyclamates to 832 rats over a much longer period of time. He found bladder cancer in only one of them, one that had received the lowest dosage, and concluded that the tumor was produced by an unrelated bladder condition. Researchers in Cambridge, Mass., and at the University of Nebraska have been pumping enormous amounts of the stuff into rats, golden hamsters and such, and find nothing unusual.

Don't expect to find cyclamates back on the supermarket shelves right away, however. The FDA has those eight rats on its hands. If they didn't develop bladder cancers after consuming the human equivalent of 200 bottles of diet cola a day for several weeks—the German rats drank the equivalent of 400 bottles a day for two years—what did cause the tumors? Was it because the U.S. researcher kept his portable radio tuned to acid rock during the experiment while Dr. Schmahl listened to Strauss? Were the American rats treated permissively while Dr. Schmahl kept his rodents regimented? Does this mean that cyclamate soft drinks are dangerous when consumed at small parties of 20, but are okay at affairs of more than 800 people? It will take time to sort things out.

COPERNICUS ANNIVERSARY BRINGS
NEW COOPERATION

HON. J. J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, five centuries ago a new citizen of Poland who was to change the thoughts of the world was born. The theories of Nicholas Copernicus have since been altered and improved—but they still stand as a brave breakthrough in man's search to understand himself and his world.

In commemoration of the insights and leadership of this great scientist, the State of Texas is sponsoring a fellowship for the advanced study of astronomy by a distinguished Polish astronomer. The astronomer will come to the University of Texas MacDonald Observatory where he will be joined by our own top astronomers.

Texas has been a leader in astronomical studies for many years. This new international venture symbolic of the efforts they have fostered to advance the knowledge of all mankind in this vital scientific field.

The new effort comes with full support of the State and its Governor. I am pleased to include in the RECORD a statement by Texas Governor Dolph Briscoe on this matter:

STATE OF TEXAS,

OFFICE OF THE GOVERNOR,

Austin, Tex., August 24, 1973.

The year 1973 is the Five Hundredth Anniversary of the birth of Nicholas Copernicus, the immortal Polish astronomer who revealed to the human race the true picture of the solar system, and this important anniversary is being celebrated by state, national and international meetings and activities. In February of this year, I issued an Official Memorandum designating February 19, 1973, as Mikolaj Kopernik Day in Texas, in recognition of the birth of this great scholar and astronomer.

Texas is one of the leading centers in the world for modern research in astronomy and the Sixty-third Legislature of the State of Texas has appropriated funds to The University of Texas at Austin to support a fellowship for the advanced study of astronomy by a distinguished Polish astronomer in Texas.

Dr. Harlan J. Smith, Director of the University of Texas McDonald Observatory, will attend the meeting of the International Astronomical Union in Poland and will make the availability of this fellowship known to appropriate Polish officials.

As Governor of the State of Texas, I do hereby support the efforts of Dr. Smith to implement the fellowship.

Sincerely

DOLPH BRISCOE.

REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER EULOGIZES
FLORIDA STATESMAN:
GOV. FULLER WARREN

HON. DON FUQUA

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Tuesday, September 25, 1973

Mr. FUQUA. Mr. Speaker, Fuller Warren has returned to his home for the last time. The former Governor of Florida who captured the imagination of the people of our State with his brilliant oratory, keen wit, and boundless enthusiasm passed away last week in Miami.

As was his wish, he came back to Calhoun County in north Florida, the county where I too was raised, for that final peace which must come to all—the great and the small.

In the case of Governor Warren, it was the former.

Men from time on will speak of his accomplishments and history will record him as one of our greatest Governors.

It was fitting that another man whose place in Florida's history is already assured should deliver his eulogy—our colleague, the Honorable CLAUDE PEPPER. I guess it could truly be said that the greatest orators our State has ever produced would have to be Governor Warren and Congressman PEPPER.

As one of the final tributes to Governor Warren, might I ask that his eulogy by Congressman PEPPER be reprinted in these pages. It is brilliant and moving—a worthy tribute by one great statesman about another.

The Reverend Samuel Lee of the Blountstown, Fla. Baptist Church presented Congressman PEPPER, who presented the following brilliant eulogy:

REPRESENTATIVE PEPPER EULOGIZES FLORIDA'S
STATESMAN: GOV. FULLER WARREN

As his loving friend for a third of a century and speaking for my wife and family who

shared my affection for him and particularly for the members of the Florida Delegation in the Congress who were prevented from coming here today on account of pressing business in Washington, I proudly but sadly join family and friends on this solemn occasion in paying tribute to this rare man, this great and good man, Fuller Warren.

Robert G. Ingersoll, speaking at the funeral of his brother, said: "This brave and tender man in times of strife and storm was oak and rock, but in sunshine he was vine and flower." It is the oak and rock, the vine and flower that was Fuller Warren which we, so much from our hearts, honor today. Shakespeare said: "Tis a common truth that lowliness is young ambition's ladder, upon which the weary climber upward wends his way, but when he once the utmost rung attains, he unto the ladder turns his back, looking out into the clouds scorns the base degrees by which he did ascend." Not Fuller Warren. Like Winston Churchill, who might have been buried in the splendor of Westminster Abbey, with England's famous dead, but preferred to return to a simple cemetery near where he was born to lie in final rest with his family, Fuller Warren who could have been buried in a marble mausoleum in Miami or Jacksonville gave instructions before he passed away, that when his time should come, when he should return from the long voyage of life, he wanted to rest here in this cemetery with his beloved family in this sacred soil that he loved so much and amongst the people of this area who were always so close to his heart.

Fuller Warren was one of those rare men who had so many aspects of genius and nobility. We know what his record was, it is a matter of public knowledge. Born in this area of sturdy and loving parents, working as a boy at a sawmill, picking cotton for 75 cents a week, delivering papers, working as a clerk, employing himself busily as he always did wherever he could, at 13 years of age, Fuller Warren manifested that dream that moved in his heart to reach higher goals in life and sought to become a Page in the Florida Legislature. Many of you here have heard Fuller tell the story of how Judge Amos Lewis, then a member of the Legislature, impressed by this lad, said: "Listen son, go back to school, prepare yourself, maybe some day you will be the Governor of this State." That was thereafter the burning ambition, the unquenchable flame in the heart of Fuller Warren.

And then he went to college at the University of Florida. He was elected President of the Sophomore Class. He waited on tables; he wrote for the college paper, again he did whatever chore would help him to earn his way through college. And then while he was a Junior at the University of Florida, he came back here to his beloved people in Calhoun county (and I have good reason to know the quality and of the loyalty and friendship there is in this great county of Calhoun and the city of Blountstown) and he was elected to the Legislature in 1927 and he served with honor, attracting the attention of all who observed the coming young men of Florida in that Legislature. And then he went to Cumberland University and graduated in law. He settled for the practice of law in Jacksonville. In 1939 he came again to the House of Representatives in the Florida Legislature, that time from Duval county and he was mounting up the rungs of the ladder toward the Governorship of his beloved State. Then he went into the service he was a gunnery officer on a naval vessel and 20 times crossed the Atlantic during the war.

When he returned from honorable and patriotic service, he was three times City Commissioner of the city of Jacksonville. In 1940, we all remember that he ran for Governor for the first time in a campaign where there were many outstanding and able candidates; two of the leading of which were Francis Whitehair and Spessard Holland. He

was the third man in that race, but ran a close third, and people knew that Fuller Warren was on the way up, was destined to reach that goal which he had cherished so long.

Finally, his happy success and victory came in 1948. I am proud that I was privileged to lend whatever aid I could to Fuller Warren in that campaign, because I knew the heart of Fuller Warren. I knew it was a pure heart and an honest one. I knew there was a passion in Fuller Warren's heart to serve the people, not to aggrandize himself in public office, not to enjoy the spoils that it might afford to the scoundrel, but to leave a monument in the hearts of people that he had sought to serve them, to lighten the burdens that they should bear, to help them to walk on higher ground.

And that is the kind of Governor Fuller Warren was. And in those four years it is now admitted by many of those who were his unfriendly critics in those years, that Fuller Warren was one of the great Governors that this State had ever had. I have here a recent article in the Miami Herald, not always a friendly commentator upon Fuller Warren and the headline is, "Fuller Warren master of rhetoric, who led Florida to progress." And here is a summary of Fuller Warren's administration also from the Miami Herald and this is what they say:

"Some of Governor Warren's accomplishments during his tenure included a new citrus code that revitalized the citrus industry, getting the State's modern highway system underway, forming a Board of Parks and Historic Memorials, a state-level industrial development and a tourist promotion program. He had tourist welcome stations built at every main highway entrance to Florida, initiated the Florida Flood Control Program, had two additional major tuberculosis sanitariums built and left the state, after paying off a debt of \$50 million with \$50 million in the treasury." Such is that brief summary of some of the accomplishments of the administration of Fuller Warren.

I shall always remember, as you will, the glow and exaltation of victory that he experienced when the final and favorable returns came in, the thrill of seeing a man realize the ambition of a life time. I remember as I am sure most of you here do, the day he was sworn in on the grounds of the Capitol, his handsome figure, that moving, booming voice of his, reaching out over the great crowd, the thousands gathered there to express their pride in his success, and to attest to him their loyalty and support.

And all of us knew him, too, in the travail and the crisis and the struggle of those eventful years. But Fuller Warren was guiding a State in transition from an old era to a new era, and only the eloquence of Fuller Warren, only his fortitude and courage, could have made possible some of the great accomplishments which will ever be the memorials and the monuments of his distinguished administration. Finally came the end of that time, but not before the name Fuller Warren was known all over America. The great movie producer Cecil B. DeMille said Fuller Warren was the greatest salesman of Florida there was. The well-known columnist of Hollywood, Louella Parsons, said Fuller Warren had the most charming personality of any man she ever met. All over America people knew Fuller Warren. Since his death was announced, member after member of the House of Representatives from states all over America have walked up to me and said, I see your great Governor down there, Fuller Warren, has passed away, I am sorry, I liked him. And so did people all over the country. I remember going with him right after his election in 1948 down to Key West to see President Truman who was there, and I noted the warmth with which President Truman greeted him and the esteem that he had for him in the later years. Then came the time of retirement.

Fuller Warren left the office of Governor of Florida with less means, in my opinion, than any man who ever served in that exalted office. I disparage no other, for they have all been most honorable men. But Fuller Warren was pure of heart and clear of conscience and high of motive. During those intervening years from the time he left the exalted office of Governor until finally he was found fallen in his apartment in Miami, Fuller Warren had to struggle to make a living. Fuller Warren saw hard times after being Governor as he had so many times seen hard times in trying to get to be Governor. And let it be a part of the record of Fuller Warren that no man lives who can point justly the accusing finger at Fuller Warren and say that he profited by the spoils of office or that he was motivated by anything other than a deep desire and a burning passion to try to help and to serve all of the people; particularly, the lowly people of this great State of Florida.

Fuller was a politician and he was proud of it. And how he was adapted to that role of the artist—the man who appeals to the public for its support—that dashing, handsome figure that he presented, that mellow, golden voice of his; that exceptional memory for names and faces; that remarkable mastery of words which he possessed; the ability to describe most uniquely all the things that others had so much difficulty defining. May I just bring back one vivid memory of those words of Fuller Warren's and his genius for uttering them. This occurred in the Miami News, but when it pleased Governor Warren he could write and I quote: "In Morris McLemore of the Miami News we witness the marvelous conflagration of a magical pen with the velvet splendor of a mellow talent. In his column a magnificent genius gives off a veritable exhalation of equatic epigram." How like Fuller; how eloquent, how beautiful, when he spoke all who heard him stood thrilled and charmed in his presence. Fuller was, therefore, best known, perhaps, as a great orator, a man who for hours could entertain and delight an audience. A man who loved to communicate with people because those words not only came out of his lips and from his tongue, they came out of his heart. And he loved the romance of public life and communication with people. But Fuller was also an author. He wrote three books on politics and public speaking—well received and well recognized for the volumes they were.

But Fuller Warren will best be remembered by those who knew him, not for what he did in the Legislature, not for the accomplishments of his administration as Governor, not for what he did as a national Democratic political leader, but for the man that Fuller Warren was; but for the warmth of his heart, the compassion that he felt for other people; particularly, the unfortunate, those who needed help the most. Another quotation from Robert Ingersoll I think aptly applied to Fuller Warren and his attitude toward people. Ingersoll said of his brother: "He added to the sum of human joy. If everyone to whom he did some loving service could bring a blossom to his grave, he would sleep tonight beneath a wilderness of flowers." How apt that is of Fuller Warren. If all over Florida and many parts of America all those to whom Fuller Warren rendered some loving service could come here to bring their one blossom, there would veritably be a wilderness of flowers that would cover this beloved soil in which he will sleep.

So that was Fuller Warren. Fuller Warren, the man; Fuller Warren, the individual; Fuller Warren, who loved people; Fuller Warren who sought to help people wherever he could. And so we say Farewell to Fuller. He knew before he passed away, he knew when he asked his brother Julian that his service might be here in this beautiful spot, that there would be here today the friends of his boyhood. And I've talked to three of

them here today; Mrs. John Fugua, Mr. Justice Roberts, and the Sheriff, who have told me about the times when they knew Fuller as a fellow student as a boy, and the Sheriff said everybody agreed in those days that there was but one Fuller Warren. He was what we lawyers call, sui generis (in a class by himself). He was what they call in the prizefighter arena, a man of class, quality; he had that rare mystic facility somehow to stir the hearts of other people. It is that Fuller Warren that we remember and who will always be cherished.

In the records and the annals of the State of Florida his accomplishments will always be recorded and preserved, but a far greater monument will rest in the indefinable memories of those who knew him with warm remembrance in their hearts as Fuller Warren, friend; Fuller Warren, man; Fuller Warren, human being. We know that for generations yet to come in this and other States, not only will they be writing and talking about Fuller Warren, but fathers will be telling their sons and mothers, their daughters, of Fuller Warren. They will say: "Son, daughter's I wish you could have known him. I wish you could have heard him, I wish you could have seen him, there was never another like Fuller Warren."

Gathered here are hundreds of loving friends of Fuller. How proud he would be if he could look upon this scene and see so many of you who have come from remote parts of Florida to join in this solemn tribute today; men who worked with him as Governor; men who shared his troubles and tribulations, his joys and his glories. You all have come here to let him know in that mysterious way that he may understand that you have not forgotten. He knew it would be this sort of a scene. His two brothers are here, his lovely sister, and other members of his family. All of us have come because we loved Fuller. We ask God to rest his soul and to bless his memory.

After the battle of Philippi, Anthony who was the conqueror, came upon the tent of his former foe, Brutus, and there Brutus lay dead. Anthony paused over the body of his foe, and as he looked down upon him, no animosity then, no triumphant utterance but encomium. As Anthony looked into that face, he said, "His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, this was a man." And we can say of Fuller Warren, "His life was gentle and the elements so mixed in him that nature might stand up and say to all the world, this was a man"—a good man, a great man.

GILMAN OPPOSES CLOSING OF SCHOENAU CASTLE

HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, the Austrian Government's improvident decision closing Schoenau Castle, which has been a transit camp for Soviet Jews in their flight from oppression in the Soviet Union, is distressing to those of us who are concerned about freedom of all peoples.

Our President's praiseworthy statements seeking Austria's reconsideration of the closing of Schoenau and urging other governments to stand up in opposition to international blackmail by terrorist groups, have apparently fallen on deaf ears. Chancellor Kreisky's refusal to reverse his decision is a regrettable display of weakness.

The world must face up to the fact that surrender to this type of blackmail can only lead to increased terrorist threats and violence.

Humanitarian governments have a moral obligation to help those fleeing from oppression. Austria, in giving in to the terrorists has turned its back on freedom—on those Soviet Jews seeking a life free from religious persecution.

I am today joining Congressman HAMILTON FISH and several of my colleagues in introducing a resolution calling upon our Nation to utilize every possible means to bring about a rescission of the order closing down Schoenau Castle.

This is not the time for complacency. It is a time for humanitarian governments throughout the world to live up to the principles of freedom and justice and to steadfastly refuse to capitulate to the demands by any terrorist.

THE PUBLIC IS NOT IMPRESSED

HON. BELLA S. ABZUG

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Ms. ABZUG. Mr. Speaker, the administration would like us to believe that the Watergate revelations are fading from people's minds. On the contrary, two polls released today demonstrate that the President is not regaining the Nation's confidence, and the sentiment for impeachment is growing.

It would be sad if it were otherwise; if the Nation were to accept apathetically an administration that has shown such flagrant disregard for elementary ethical principles.

An editorial in today's New York Times points out the danger of moral "slippage." By contrast it is heartening to read the polls and discover that the American people are not being deceived. I would like to insert the polls and the editorial into the RECORD:

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1973]

THE GALLUP POLL—NIXON FAILING TO RECOVER POPULARITY

(By George Gallup)

PRINCETON, N.J.—President Nixon is having difficulty in regaining the confidence of the American people. Only 32 per cent in the latest survey express approval of his performance as chief executive, one percentage point above his low point recorded in early August.

Concern over the economy is having an adverse effect on the President's popularity, as it has had on the popularity of previous Presidents.

At the present time, inflation far overshadows all other worries of the American people, with 9 persons in every 10 naming it as one of the top problems facing the nation. The percentage naming inflation is the highest recorded in the history of the Gallup Poll, dating back to 1935.

In addition, Mr. Nixon is making little headway in terms of public confidence regarding Watergate. Despite his recent press conferences—in which he dealt with Watergate—as many American as before (3 in 4 in the latest survey) think he was involved in Watergate at least to some extent.

This is the question which has been asked about the incumbent President since the Roosevelt years to measure presidential popularity:

Do you approve or disapprove of the way Nixon is handling his job as President?

The table below shows the latest national findings:

(In percent)

Approve	32
Disapprove	59
No opinion	9

The latest findings reported today are based on a national survey of 1,505 adults, 18 and older. Interviewing was conducted in person in more than 300 scientifically selected localities during the period Sept. 21-24.

[From the Washington Post, Oct. 4, 1973]
THE HARRIS SURVEY—IMPEACHMENT GAINS SUPPORT ON TAPE ISSUE

(By Louis Harris)

By 51 to 34 per cent, a majority of the American people feels that "Congress would be justified to begin impeachment proceedings against President Nixon" if he refused a court order directing him to turn over Watergate tape recordings to a panel of judges.

The conclusion of a special, in-depth Harris Survey, conducted between Sept. 23 and 25 among 1,475 households nationwide, is that with the passage of time President Nixon is in deeper trouble over Watergate, rather than the issue receding in importance. The public, previously reluctant to contemplate impeachment of the President, now is actively considering this a real prospect.

Here are other highlights from the survey: By 47 to 39 per cent, a plurality of the public now believes that "if the U.S. Senate Watergate committee decides that President Nixon was involved in the Watergate cover-up," then "Congress should impeach him." A month earlier the public rejected impeachment even in the face of such charges by the Watergate committee, by 50 to 39 per cent. The latest results therefore indicate a sharp turnaround by the public on the impeachment issue.

The American people simply do not buy Mr. Nixon's argument that executive privilege and separation of powers between the executive and other branches of the federal government justify his withholding the tapes. By a substantial 56 to 29 per cent, a majority thinks the President was "wrong to appeal the decision of Judge Sirica that he allow the Judge to hear the tapes on Watergate." Although the normal judicial processes give Mr. Nixon every right to appeal a District Court decision, nonetheless the net effect in the case of the President and the tapes has been to sow in deeper the impression that he is using legal maneuvers to conceal the contents of the tapes.

A further indication of the worsening of Mr. Nixon's position is evident in the results of yet another question in the latest survey, in which, by 50 to 39 per cent, the public expresses the view that "if it is proven that President Nixon knew about the cover-up of White House involvement in Watergate, he should resign." In August, an identical question yielded a 49-to-44 per cent plurality which thought he should not resign, even if such proof were forthcoming.

By 60 to 24 per cent, a majority of the American people has reached the conclusion that the President "did know about the attempt to cover up White House involvement in Watergate while it was going on." However, when asked "in view of what has happened in the Watergate affair, should President Nixon resign or not?" by 56 to 31 per cent a majority still believes he should not resign.

The public wants to be fair and is reluctant to think of resignation or impeachment until the link has been made between an official charge or finding by the Senate Watergate committee, or a court, that Mr. Nixon was involved in the cover-up, or until the President actually refuses a court order

to turn over the tapes in camera to a panel of judges. However, the number who believe Mr. Nixon should resign has gone up steadily from 14 to 31 per cent since last May.

[From the New York Times, Oct. 4, 1973]

QUESTION OF SLIPPAGE

"It's a question of slippage," said Jeb Stuart Magruder in a discussion of Watergate in Harper's Magazine. "I sort of slipped into it."

Mr. Magruder has diagnosed not just his but the nation's ethical decline. Slippage has created a public climate and a governmental condition that made possible Watergate, the plumbers, the wiretapping, the break-ins, the shredding and forging of documents, the Cambodian bombing, the mass-arrest without warrants.

Slippage is responsible for the improbable situation that finds the President's real estate and tax dealings subject to ethical, if not legal, questions; the Vice President facing investigations concerning alleged financial improprieties; a former Attorney General and a former Commerce Secretary under indictment; another Attorney General departed because of his personal relationships with persons suspected of wrongdoing; the President's personal lawyer implicated in the handling of hush-money; major corporations found guilty of large, illegal political campaign contributions; high-ranking Central Intelligence Agency officials subsidizing illegal domestic espionage; senior Presidential aides dismissed after public charges of extensive abuse of their powers.

In Mr. Magruder's terms, the nation has been "slipping into it" for a long time. Through all the decades, for example, during which Presidents and Attorneys General looked the other way when J. Edgar Hoover allowed the F.B.I. to overstep the bounds of legality in the use of unauthorized wiretaps, Americans slipped imperceptibly into acceptance of such violations—always presumably for extraordinarily good reasons.

The American people thus were being conditioned to accept the "no-knock" legislation, which, of course, was only to be used against the bad guys to protect law and order. As soon as the laws were on the books, careless, incompetent or corrupt policemen staged no-knock narcotics raids into innocent homes. It then was only natural to slip into the harassment of the victims to frighten them into silence.

Vietnam was, of course, the most awesome example of slippage, gathering irreversible momentum until each deception needed to be kept hidden by greater deception until the secret bombing of neutral Cambodia.

Dwight Eisenhower showed a shrewd understanding of the danger of slippage when he forced Sherman Adams to resign. The indiscretion the Presidential adviser had committed seems absurdly inconsequential when measured against the current scene, but President Eisenhower apparently sensed the ultimate danger of slippage once unethical behavior were to be implicitly condoned in high places. Regrettably, Mr. Eisenhower was either less perceptive or less resistant to political pressures when he chose to come to terms in the matter of the Nixon campaign fund. The stretching of political ethics at that historic point allowed Mr. Nixon to turn a shoddy episode into a sentimental triumph of the Checkers speech.

The theory of slippage has been used by the Nixon Administration's apologists as an excuse for the White House horrors. The refrain of their song of moral whitewash is "they've all been doing it," implying that thus there is no cause for alarm or harsh corrective measures.

This is clearly an immoral and, from the point of view of the nation's future, a fatal conclusion. A more appropriate assessment is that the Nixon Administration, cynically exploiting the gradual slippage into moral

and ethical confusion, has taken the country on an unprecedented downhill slide.

As long as slippage remained a matter of slow decline in standards, there was hope that relatively routine reforms could reverse the trend. Now, the rescue from the pit requires a different effort. Just a little polishing of campaign practices is no longer enough. Neither is a gentle Congressional pull on the leash of Presidential warmaking powers.

The integrity of the United States Government cannot be reestablished without the application of tough standards to the personal and fiscal integrity of its top officials. Most important, the civil liberties of all Americans will not be secure until the doctrine of the President's inherent power to suspend them, in person or through his surrogates, is publicly disowned and its apparatus dismantled.

UNICEF WOULD CHANNEL AID TO NORTH VIETNAM

HON. JOHN M. ASHBROOK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, UNICEF, a United Nations agency heavily dependent on American financial contributions, is on the verge of giving aid to both North Vietnam and Communist-controlled areas in South Vietnam. UNICEF's executive board has already authorized extending aid to North Vietnam and to the Communists in the South as part of a \$300 million program for Indochina in 1973-74. Recent reports indicate that Hanoi is now negotiating with UNICEF officials in order to obtain this assistance.

Analysis of the 1972 UNICEF budget shows the great extent to which the agency is dependent on American private and governmental contributions. Last year the U.S. Government contributed \$15 million to UNICEF. This constituted 30.4 percent of the total Government contributions received by that agency. The share contributed by the U.S.S.R.—including the Ukraine and Byelorussia—totaled less than 2 percent.

The U.S. share of contributions from nongovernmental sources is even greater. American citizens donated approximately \$5.9 million, over 50 percent of all money received by UNICEF from nongovernmental sources. Nothing was received from the U.S.S.R.—including the Ukraine and Byelorussia.

The U.S. share of UNICEF greeting card sales and related operations also is a very high percentage. During the 1971-72 sales campaign, Americans bought over 41 percent of the cards purchased and were responsible for two-fifths of the total sales revenues. The share of cards purchased in the U.S.S.R.—including the Ukraine and Byelorussia—was negligible.

Since well over one-third of the total revenue received by UNICEF comes from the United States, I am unalterably opposed to UNICEF's proposed contributions. Whether or not the aid has been specifically raised in the United States, the contributions are actually made possible by the fact that the United States is financing such a large share of UNICEF

operations. These contributions can only strengthen Hanoi's position in North Vietnam and in the territory it now occupies in South Vietnam. Why should the United States be donating such large sums of money to an organization that is working against our own best interests? It is also extremely doubtful whether distribution of the aid can be adequately supervised so as to assure its proper and intended use in either North Vietnam or Communist-controlled areas in the South.

THE ROLE OF THE CHURCH IN BLACK AMERICA

HON. CHARLES B. RANGEL

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. RANGEL. Mr. Speaker, Rev. Lawrence E. Lucas, pastor of Harlem's Resurrection Church, has been an outstanding leader in my community for many years. His dedicated concern for the people of Harlem is well known. Further, Reverend Lucas has been a leader in the area of religion and is well versed on the role that the church plays in the lives of black Americans today.

I am inserting in the RECORD, an article which Reverend Lucas recently wrote for the Amsterdam News regarding the present state of religion. I found this article to be most perceptive and am sure that it will be of great interest to my colleagues.

The article follows:

THE CHURCH IS REGRESSING

(By Rev. Lawrence E. Lucas)

Basically, I believe that in spite of a new rhetoric in some places, the church and "religion" is regressing, though there are certainly exceptions. Worse, the backward plunge is being done so sophistically, it may look like forging ahead.

The following, in sketchy form, are some of the reasons for my conclusion.

1. The church or religion still functions as a haven away from the world rather than enlightenment and empowerment to confront the world. Much of it boils down to providing a day—Sunday and Saturday still predominate—to escape and to sing one's care away.

Preachment, "worship", song are tonics to help us cope with, and even be happy, in the white man's world. His world it must remain. Our reward is in the world to come.

2. Survival is the great goal. In Scripture, on the contrary, survival apart from the manner of survival is not a Christ goal. Survival in an oppressive society in which one has no power, no self-respect, no people he calls his own can be accomplished only by selling oneself to that society.

Such a one, such a group will hardly be engaged in destroying that kind of society to create something new. That true Christianity must be so engaged is why Christ promised his real followers only persecution and death in this life.

Future rewards are contingent upon our Engagement in the struggle, not sitting on our backsides waiting on the messiah to do it all while we sing "We shall overcome" on Sundays and B.S. and entertain from Monday to Saturday.

"LOVING THE ENEMY"

3. Most still believe the essence of Christianity is "loving the enemy" and "turning the other cheek". Unfortunately, "loving the

enemy" is interpreted as letting him continue to oppress and brutalize you and "turning the other cheek" is exclusive to the oppressed.

Some non-Christian religious groups, while denying this in their rhetoric, economically, socially, morally are still aping the white man's systems, thus proving again the tragic truth that the oppressed invariably internalizes the image of the oppressor and adopts his guidelines. The oppressor becomes for the oppressed their model of manhood and the ways of the former become the goals of the latter.

4. The church still encourages the belief that entering into middle America—white America that is—is a worthwhile goal for Black people. Few questions are asked concerning what is white America about.

Moreover, the "Christian" way of entering middle America is, adjusting to whites, bootlicking the white lords of the system and using only the tools whites give us—tools made for our suppression. Those organizations and individuals who make "tremendous gains for Blacks" in this way are the "Christian ideals".

5. Most still internalize Jesus a white liberal rather than a strong, Black, true revolutionary.

6. Most Black church folk still think it's possible to love others (meaning white folks) without first respecting and loving themselves individually and collectively. Further, they think love between Black and white is possible under present conditions.

7. Because of these beliefs long-taught them by white "Christians" and their yet faithful Negro trainees (and in other ways by non-Christian hustlers), the church's (Black and white) dealing with Blacks is still mostly by way of "white generosity".

This means always protective of and subservient to the white system. This "charity" constrains the fearful and subdued to extend their trembling and grateful hands. An unjust social order is the permanent fount of this "generosity".

In order to have the continued opportunity to express their "generosity", the oppressor much perpetuate injustice as well. Brainwashed Black religion goes along with this program.

Black religion, the Black church if it is to be authentic and salvific must begin to deal with this plethora of garbage imposed on Black minds in the name of Christianity.

It must be willing to teach its adherents that, unless one is going to continue to call Blacks' servile service of whites "love", that love can't begin to exist between Black and white in the slave master context that is America.

It must begin to teach forcefully that the Christian mission is not talking and singing about love but fighting and struggling and dying to create a society in which real love is possible.

The church must help people to recognize that freedom is a prerequisite for love and that, therefore, the fact of white domination and exploitation must be dealt with critically and powerfully.

It must start to build in the minds of Blacks a new image of what man is, a new idea of what society can be. That being a man is not becoming like the oppressor. That transforming society is not putting more Blacks in the white system.

Not only in word but in action, the church will have to face the problem of freedom and love in the milieu of American society. Rather than talking about "integration" in the present context, a real priority towards Blacks and non-whites as proportionately America's poor, oppressed, imprisoned, exploited must be lived.

The church cannot talk love and at the same time flee its responsibility of confronting the tremendous obstacle of love, white America and its systems and institutions.

THE PEOPLE'S CHURCH

Finally, two signs (not exclusive) will indicate when the "church" will really start becoming the Church. First, the church will understand that the oppressor cannot liberate himself or the oppressed.

Only the oppressed enlightened and motivated to liberate himself can liberate both himself and the oppressor, thus the church (the church as people, not just ministers and priests) will start becoming poor.

It will begin to empty its portfolios of stocks of some of America's largest, most ruthless and exploitative corporations. It will cease relying on the oppressor to fund and approve its programs and actions (unless it means "white charity and generosity" type programs).

Second, the church will be designated criminal, subversive and all the other names used by those in power. It boils down to this: The church or religion will continue to be regressive until it begins to be a movement totally subversive of America, its real way of life and all its systems and institutions.

The reason is that America's systems and institutions are ungodly, oppressive, unjust, unchristian, racist and dehumanizing not only of its non-white oppressed but its white oppressors (though it dehumanizes both in different ways and not with the same effects).

Thus, the real sign will be the church's becoming an object of persecution. This is the Cross involved in confronting the forces of oppression and in trying to deal with your oppressed own who have been conditioned to survive in oppression and to be terrified by the thought and prospects of their own freedom.

AUSTRIA SHOULD CHANGE ITS MIND AND AID EMIGRATION

HON. JONATHAN B. BINGHAM
OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BINGHAM. Mr. Speaker, on September 29, immediately upon learning of the Austrian Government's capitulation to terrorist demands, I issued the following statement:

I fervently hope the Austrian Government will continue or promptly resume its longstanding humanitarian policy of facilitating the emigration of Soviet Jews to Israel.

I simply cannot believe that a proud sovereign nation with great traditions would reverse an important national policy because of criminal threats by two terrorists.

In April 1972, I witnessed the arrival of Soviet Jews by train in Vienna and their departure by air to Israel. I visited the transit center at Schonau. What I saw was utterly moving. The Austrian Government has witnessed these same sights day after day for two years. It would be unbelievably cruel for that government now to slam the gates and crush the hopes of tens of thousands who are waiting in the Soviet Union for a chance to emigrate to freedom.

It would be difficult if not impossible for the Jewish Agency to arrange for these people to transit to Israel by way of some other country.

Especially tragic would be the precedent set if the Austrian Government in fact gives way to these terrorists' demand. The Palestinian terrorists would then be encouraged to continue their banditry to pressure other governments to give way to their political blackmail.

On October 3, the Washington Post expressed very much the same view, as follows:

AUSTRIA CAVES IN TO BLACKMAIL

Somehow—how could it happen without Soviet knowledge?—two Palestinians carrying machine guns and grenades last Friday boarded a train carrying Soviet Jewish emigrants to Austria. Once inside Austria, the pair grabbed three of the Jews and an Austrian customs official and demanded to leave the country with their captives. Astonishingly, the Austrian government apparently volunteered, in return for the hostages' release, to shut down the processing facility near Vienna through which some 70,000 Soviet Jews have passed to Israel in the past three years. This was an offer going far beyond the Palestinians' own aim, which apparently was only to dramatize their opposition to emigration to Israel.

What is at stake is not so much the emigration itself, since alternate routes and procedures can probably be found, but the concept of a state's sovereign responsibility for people staying lawfully and peacefully on its soil. Instead of protecting such people, Austria has yielded its authority to two wayward criminals. Israel's Prime Minister tried yesterday, without apparent success, to persuade Chancellor Kreisky to revoke his decision. It is not merely a propaganda victory for the Palestinians and an encouragement to further acts of terrorism, it is a heavy blow to the very purpose of government.

Whatever changes may be made in the emigration flow, one can only be appalled at the example of Austria's groveling. Mr. Kreisky says he does not wish neutral Austria to become "a secondary theater of the Middle East conflict," as though any unfolding on that scale could actually happen. He seems unconcerned that overnight his country should suffer the loss of the most meaningful element of its international position, its status as a humanitarian refuge. Reacting to home and foreign criticism, the Chancellor says stiffly that "the worst thing in this matter would be to put pressure on us." But to take offense at pressure applied for a cause of conscience, while bowing to the pressure of terrorism, is a bald inconsistency. He says that persons with individual visas will still be allowed free transit through Austria; the Russians release Jews only in groups and do not give them individual visas. He claims to have acted to ensure the safety of emigrants at the 420-acre Schonau Castle facility but emigrants have been processed safely there and their safety will obviously be more difficult to guarantee if they are forced into public facilities in Vienna itself.

We trust Austria will find the dignity to set Mr. Kreisky's decision aside.

So far Chancellor Kreisky has insisted that his decision is final. I trust that this will not be his last word.

I do not believe there is any way that the United States can force Chancellor Kreisky to change his mind, especially in view of the fact that Austria's record up to now has been so outstandingly good in regard to sheltering refugees. But hopefully he will feel the impact of public opinion in America and elsewhere.

A SALUTE TO LOUIS FREEMAN

HON. RONALD V. DELLUMS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DELLUMS. Mr. Speaker, on October 1, many citizens of the bay area will gather to honor one of its most distinguished professionals and community leaders, Mr. Louis Freeman.

Louis Freeman has been employed for the past 13 years by radio station KDIA, which is the only radio station in the bay area that is programmed for a predominantly black audience. Prior to going to KDIA, and throughout his tenure there, Lou Freeman has been a trail blazer and pathfinder for blacks in general, and for blacks in the media in particular. He was the first full-time black news director in the bay area. Not satisfied with being the first or the only, he used his prodigious energy, his vast intelligence, and his extraordinary personal skills to assist large numbers of blacks to obtain opportunities in the media. There are few minorities in the broadcasting media in our area who do not owe their present opportunities to Lou Freeman, either because they were under his personal guidance and tutelage, or because of his influence upon and respect among those who control the media in this area.

Lou Freeman is also a resourceful and creative professional. He has a genuine commitment to raising the spirit and educational level of his people. His interests are all encompassing, ranging from gospel music to events of national and international importance. He pioneered in developing public affairs programs and providing political coverage that would convey these great events and experiences to the households of his listeners. His programs are generally regarded as being without parallel or precedent in this area, and those he did personally were always done with immaculateness, with grace, and with penetrating intelligence.

I have been informed that Lou Freeman has resigned from his job as a result of a long, and to date inconclusive, battle with migraine headaches. On October 7, his friends will not only honor Lou Freeman the man and the professional; in addition, they will raise money that will be used to establish an information and research foundation to study the illness that he has suffered over the years. I would take this opportunity to inform my colleagues in the Congress of this noble man, and of his worthy effort. Lou Freeman has been a personal friend, but he is more; he is a symbol of the best that we are capable of as human beings, manifesting the spirit, the compassion, the dedication to public service, and the fidelity to high principle that the exercise of which has made this world a better place for his having lived. I join my friends in the bay area in their salute to Lou Freeman, and in this additional effort for which his vision is largely responsible.

THE FERTILIZER SITUATION

HON. JOHN C. CULVER

OF IOWA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. CULVER. Mr. Speaker, the impending shortage in fertilizer supplies is one of the most serious problems now facing the Nation's farmers. A critical shortage of fertilizer threatens the increased agricultural production now

being encouraged to help stabilize food prices for the American consumer.

A House Agriculture Subcommittee has been conducting hearings on the fertilizer situation. Since this is a matter which will be receiving increasing congressional attention, I insert the testimony I submitted on this subject during the hearings held today.

STATEMENT OF HON. JOHN C. CULVER

I welcome this opportunity to express my intense concern over the fertilizer situation and the distressing consequences in Iowa as well as in other parts of the nation of a critical fertilizer shortage.

During the last year, most Americans have become acutely aware of the close correlation and interplay between U.S. agricultural productivity and the stability of food prices at the supermarket. As a result, there is now an energetic effort, reinforced by the new agricultural legislation adopted by the Congress, to encourage agricultural producers to expand their production of food and fiber during the next year. The looming threat of a shortage in fertilizer supplies poses one of the greatest threats to the success of this effort.

A potential shortage of one million tons of nitrogen has been predicted for fiscal 1974. This shortage could result in significantly lower crop yields because of the reduction in nitrogen application rates. The consequences of this situation are obvious. Our efforts to increase the crop acreage under production may be counterbalanced by a reduction in the potential crop output per acre. Furthermore, many farmers who face favorable market prospects this year will be denied an essential tool in bringing about a successful harvest. The most serious and widespread impact will occur during spring planting next year.

The expected shortage in fertilizer supplies is largely the result of both increased domestic and increased foreign demand. Most proposals advanced so far hinge on the removal of controls on domestic prices or on the placing of controls on exports. Either policy could have undesirable side effects and neither may offer a reliable long-term solution.

In my judgment, imposing export controls would offer, at the very best, a solution of dubious merit. My principal objections to this action can be briefly summarized as follows:

1. Exports do not consume a very large portion of our production of fertilizer—as a result, export controls will not substantially increase available supplies;

2. The United States is both an exporter and an importer of fertilizer, so that export restrictions by this country could produce similar action by the nations from which we import fertilizer;

3. Blocking the trade in fertilizer would reduce the available supplies for the world market, further increasing foreign prices, and this would adversely affect the long-term situation;

4. Export controls will damage the U.S. efforts to reduce agricultural trade barriers in the coming trade talks;

5. Placing embargoes on agricultural products would set an ill-advised precedent at a time when we are seeking to expand trade of many other agricultural products.

One step which could be taken at this time, short of export controls, is for the Secretary of the Treasury to discontinue the use of the Domestic International Sales Corporation by exporters of fertilizers. In a time of domestic scarcity, the government should not be granting financial incentives for the export of a product needed at home.

A significant factor contributing to the short supply of fertilizer for domestic consumption is the price ceiling imposed on fertilizer by the Cost of Living Council. The present price differential between domestic

and foreign prices, in some cases as much as \$30 a ton, encourages exportation. Such a situation also discourages investment for needed expansion of domestic refining capacity.

One solution to the current situation, therefore, would be to remove the existing controls on the price of fertilizer. While this would result in a higher fertilizer price to farmers, the projected 1974 crop prices and expected crop demand will make this additional expenditure financially justifiable. It has been suggested, however, that removing controls would probably not make much more fertilizer available for farmers during the coming season because a substantial portion of fertilizer export sales are already contracted. But the estimates on the extent to which supplies are tied up in export contracts vary widely. I would urge this committee and the Administration to fully investigate and consider this aspect of the problem before acting to remove the price controls.

If it can be demonstrated that removing price controls would assure a significant increase in the domestic supply of fertilizer, this action ought to be taken as soon as possible.

It must be recognized, however, that the long-term solution to the fertilizer situation is more complex than the temporary relief which may be provided by removing controls on prices. There are many other factors contributing to the current situation. The shortage of nitrogen, for example, derives not just from increased foreign sales due to higher foreign prices, but also from the jump in acreage under cultivation and the limited supply of natural gas. The shortage of natural gas limits production of anhydrous ammonia, the basic nitrogen product.

While the first serious effect of the fertilizer shortage will be seen next spring, some experts believe a shortage will prevail during most of this decade. It is essential, therefore, that a long-range plan be developed now to meet this impending crisis. Because of the complexity of the problem and the wide range effects of general policies dealing with the situation, it may be necessary to establish a high-level, interagency task force to deal with the fertilizer situation. I am not suggesting another ineffective study commission, but rather a decision-making group with the power to take decisive action and set policies in this area which are responsive to the public interest.

The following are a few examples of some of the matters such a task force might consider:

The necessity, if any, of allocating fertilizer supplies in areas where a shortage is particularly acute. About 25 percent of nitrogen, for example, is now used in nonfarm activities, and a system of priority for use may become necessary in some areas of the country;

The governmental action, if any, which may be needed to assure that independent fertilizer retailers are not forced out of business because major producers will not supply them, as has happened to some independent petroleum dealers during the fuel shortage;

The policies which ought to be considered to encourage needed expansion and construction of nitrogen refining plants in this country (e.g. tax write-offs or other financial incentives) or possible construction of new plants in foreign areas, such as the Middle East, which could supply our market;

The action which may be taken to alleviate the shortage of natural gas needed to refine nitrogen or to establish a high-priority of natural gas use for ammonia producers;

The action government can take to encourage more importation of natural gas, such as international agreements like the one recently announced to import more natural gas into this country from the oil-producing Arab nations;

Any other proposal which will help to ensure an adequate supply of fertilizer at a reasonable price in the years ahead.

Therefore, while removal of the price controls on domestic fertilizer products and of the DISC incentive on fertilizer exports may help to provide a short term solution to the fertilizer situation, it is imperative that intensive study be given to determine what action will be most effective in alleviating the fertilizer shortage in the coming years. The seriousness and the urgency of the situation must be recognized. The shortage will be most severe during next spring's planting and it could lead to higher food prices for consumers and lower income for farmers. The government must act before the full force of a crisis is upon us.

DENNIS MCGARRY, AN OUTSTANDING AMERICAN FROM CHEEKTOWAGA, N.Y.

HON. JACK F. KEMP

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. KEMP. Mr. Speaker, since we gained our independence nearly 200 years ago, the pages of U.S. history are full of accounts of Americans helping the people of other nations, collectively and individually.

Today, that traditional spirit of international neighborliness is as vital as any time and is epitomized by the some 7,600 Peace Corps volunteers extending a person-to-person helping hand in 61 developing nations around the world.

Among these selfless and dedicated Americans is Dennis J. McGarry, a native of Erie County, N.Y., which I have the privilege to represent.

As his older brother, Thomas Daniel McGarry, who served as a Peace Corps volunteer in India, Dennis is giving his talents and energy to showing frontier farmers in Ecuador that opportunities and skills are basic rights of every human being and that the grasping of these produce undreamed rewards, including greater freedom of the human spirit.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas D. McGarry of 537 Huth Road, Cheektowaga, N.Y., Dennis is prepared mentally, physically and spiritually for his current rigorous tasks.

At St. Mary's High School, in Lancaster, N.Y., Dennis was a rugged right tackle, an "up front guy" spearheading the path of ball carriers. He went on to play semiprofessional football with the Lockport Travelers and pursue his studies at the State University of New York at Buffalo, where he obtained his degree with a major in history in 1970.

When he joined the Peace Corps, he pursued additional training in animal husbandry and agriculture. Now, after extending his voluntary service a year, he is considering a career in the veterinary field.

He hopes to demonstrate, he says:

That U.S. citizens are real people, too.

Mr. Speaker, Dennis McGarry represents the finest among our young citizens. He is the kind of competitive, dedicated American who promises a better tomorrow

for the people of our Nation and our world neighbors.

At this point, I include an account of his activities in Ecuador which was published by ACTION, the Federal agency administering the Peace Corps and other volunteer programs.

BUFFALO AREA MAN SERVING WITH PEACE CORPS HELPS ECUADOR FARMERS IMPROVE LIVESTOCK

Peace Corps volunteer Dennis J. McGarry of Cheektowaga, N.Y. was not exactly welcomed with open arms when he arrived in Santo Domingo de Los Colorados in Ecuador two years ago to work as an animal husbandry extension agent.

"Slowly and cautiously I had to gain the confidence of these tough, frontier-like farmers, first learning how things were done on their respective farms and providing technical aids applicable with little or no cost to the farmers," he recalled.

Eventually, after repeated visits to each farm and countless chats with the farmers over the local brew, McGarry's suggestions on improved breeding practices, health programs and better management caught on. Now, with his work well in progress, McGarry has extended his Peace Corps service for an extra year to continue working with a Peace Corps heifer project under the Ecuadorian ministry of agriculture.

The son of Mr. and Mrs. Thomas D. McGarry of 537 Huth Road, Cheektowaga, McGarry, 26, actually is entering his fourth year of Peace Corps service. He served for a year in Guatemala before going to Ecuador and, he acknowledges, "I still carry a warm spot in my heart for the Guatemaltecos."

It was in Guatemala, he said, "where I received the majority of my newly adopted technical experience in cattle extension work as well as the ability to learn to laugh, cry and single with fellow Americans south of the Rio Grande and the borders of America as I had known it for some 22 years."

The heifer project with which McGarry is serving in Ecuador loans purebred stock to low-income farmers, who in turn loan some of the offspring of the original stock to other farmers. Its purpose is to help raise the income of small farmers and improve the quality of livestock and nutrition in the country. Its effects, McGarry said, cannot be measured immediately.

"The cattle business is a long-range operation," he pointed out. "Improvements applied now may not be notable in five to ten years. In this aspect, anxiety has to be conquered by both the volunteer and his counterpart, the small farmer."

The project's cattle demonstration ranch offers monthly half-day courses for area cattlemen. When McGarry first arrived, he invited 15 farmers to attend a session—and not one showed up. But things have changed. For one recent session, McGarry personally invited eight farmers to attend. The word got around and, to his amazement, 13 farmers came to the course.

Better understanding between Americans and Ecuadorians is another of McGarry's goals as a Peace Corps volunteer.

"The people here tend to outdo the climate in warmth," he said. "The culture is truly noble. I hope to demonstrate by living and enjoying the Latin culture and life—a pleasure—that U.S. citizens are real people too and don't only drive big pick-up trucks building oil wells and pipelines."

"I've been able to look at the United States through the eyes of a foreigner and hope that my experiences, when I return home, may be shared by my friends and fellow countrymen."

McGarry is a 1970 graduate of the State University of New York at Buffalo, where he majored in history.

He is one of about 200 Peace Corps volunteers serving in Ecuador in a variety of

agriculture, rural development, professional services and other programs. Around the world, about 7,600 Peace Corps volunteers are serving in 61 developing nations.

The Peace Corps is part of ACTION, the federal agency established by President Nixon in July, 1971 to administer volunteer programs at home and overseas. Mike Balzano is director of ACTION.

ACTION's domestic programs are Volunteers in Service to America (VISTA), Foster Grandparents Program, Service Corps of Retired Executives (SCORE), Active Corps of Executives (ACE), Retired Senior Volunteer Program (RSVP) and University Year for ACTION.

CONSTITUTIONALITY OF CONGRESSIONAL DELEGATION OF LEGISLATIVE AUTHORITY

HON. HENRY P. SMITH III

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. SMITH of New York. Mr. Speaker, one of our colleagues has raised a point with respect to the constitutionality of the delegation of legislative powers contained in H.R. 9682, the District of Columbia Self-Government and Governmental Reorganization Act.

This question has been subject to extensive legal research in the past. In 1959, Mr. Reuss of Wisconsin provided the Congress with an excellent study of this important question, and it appears in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of August 20, 1959, at page 16614. I urge interested Members to refer to this study and statement. Mr. Reuss' conclusion that Congress may delegate legislative power to a local government has been supported and upheld time and time again.

The Firemen's Insurance Company against Washington, decided in July of this year, is the most recent case holding that the power of Congress to delegate legislative authority to the District of Columbia is beyond question. The opinion provides that—

Congress, in legislating for the District, has all the powers of a state legislature, and Congress may delegate to the District government that "full legislative authority, subject, of course, to Constitutional limitations to which all lawmaking is subservient and subject also to the power of Congress to any time to revise, alter, or revoke the authority granted."

The court continued that—

When Congress delegates its police power to the local government, that entity's powers become as broad as those of Congress, limited only by the Constitution or specific Congressional enactment.

H.R. 9682 provides that—

Except as provided in sections 601, 602, and 603 (having to do with retention of congressional authority, specific limitations, and limitations on borrowing and spending) the legislative power of the District shall extend to all rightful subjects of legislation within the District consistent with the Constitution of the United States and the provisions of the Act, subject to all restrictions and limitations imposed upon the States by the tenth section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States.

H.R. 9682 also specifies that Congress retains ultimate legislative authority

over the District and that it may initiate legislation at any time dealing with District matters. It may also pass a bill overriding council action and either House may veto any charter changes. Thus it is clear that under H.R. 9682, consistent with the long line of legal precedents, the most recent of which is the Firemen's Insurance case, the Congress retains ultimate legislative authority over the District of Columbia as required by the Constitution.

BETTER HOME & GARDENS SPOTLIGHTS PITTSBURGH

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, the September issue of Better Home & Gardens magazine carried a delightful and quite flattering article on my city of Pittsburgh.

The story captured the vibrancy and charm of Pittsburgh with its championship sports teams, new stadium, contemporary architecture and historical buildings, night spots, and ethnic diversity.

It has taken Pittsburgh a long time to shake the "Smoky City" label. The image hung on many years after the smoke was gone. But Pittsburgh is there for all to see. And I wish my colleagues and their constituents all would do just that, come to Pittsburgh.

I would like to include the magazine article in the RECORD at this time.

PRODIGIOUS PITTSBURGH

The gleam on Pittsburgh's face today is no accident. It is the second richest city in the country in terms of its "invested capital," as good a yardstick as any. (New York tops the list.) That kind of wealth was a very important factor when, some 30 years ago, the city fathers and influential citizens decided to launch a full-scale, city-wide renaissance—the chances of a good renaissance being better if there's someone to pay the bills.

The result is a city architecturally transformed and a city wherein cultural pursuits and recreation facilities are pretty much industry and industry-foundation underwritten and available to the public free, or for nominal admission charges. Big money has brought architectural excellence and harmony for Pittsburgh's downtown. It has razed commercial slums to build a park. It has restored, renovated, and polished away the grime in old sections and from buildings of merit. It has built new museums, theaters, civic centers, and recreation and cultural complexes. There are many, many events: fairs, festivals, concerts, plays, art shows, craft demonstrations, science shows, films, and fashion shows. There are parks, museums, and memorials. And reaching for your wallet at the entrance is often unnecessary.

But if you want to spend money in this hilly city, divided by rivers and laced together by bridges, you won't have any trouble finding things to spend it on. Today's Pittsburgh is a very cosmopolitan city with elegant stores, restaurants, theaters, and art galleries.

The Golden Triangle, focal point of Pittsburgh's rejuvenation, and headquarters for 23 of the world's largest corporations, starts from the point of land formed by the confluence of the Monongahela, Allegheny, and Ohio Rivers. Formerly a commercial slum,

the area has been transformed into lovely 36-acre Point State Park, which sits like a spacious front lawn for the cluster of new skyscrapers that have so dramatically changed the city's skyline.

Adjacent to Point State Park is Gateway Center, a high-rise complex of six dramatic skyscrapers, the Hilton Hotel, plazas, fountains, shrubs, flowers, trees, and underground parking facilities. Gateway Center is also the host-area for the annual springtime Three Rivers Arts Festival.

Held the last week in May, the festival, sponsored by the Carnegie Institute, is perhaps the prime example of what you get for free in Pittsburgh. It is a ten-day cultural extravaganza—performing arts and arts and crafts—with something for everybody.

Most of the city's major new office buildings lie within a mile of Point State Park. So do the major department stores—Kaufmann's and Gimbel's on Smithfield Street, Joseph Horne's on Stanwix Street. Along the main downtown avenues, you'll find shops ranging in style and substance from Sak's Fifth Avenue to very hip boutiques.

A visit to Market Square is a must to see the colorful outdoor food markets where stands overflow with products from staple to exotic. On a good day, there are thousands of customers. Market Square is also the city's night life center. You can eat and drink to good jazz at Buddie's, sing along at the piano bar at Gallagher's Pub, find continuous entertainment at the Cheshire Cat, and tap your feet to the music at Walt Harper's Attic.

Heinz Hall, a theater for the performing arts, is a good example of Pittsburgh's respect for the past. The home of the Pittsburgh Opera, Ballet, Civic Light Opera, Youth Symphony, and Symphony Orchestra, the theater was redesigned two years ago around the heart of a magnificent movie palace of Hollywood's Golden Era.

Shadyside, another renaissance creation, is Pittsburgh's Greenwich Village. There you'll find all sorts of boutiques, galleries, craft shops, zippy restaurants, and pubs with entertainment and music.

Just across the Allegheny River, on Pittsburgh's near North Side, is the Three Rivers Stadium, the glistening bowl in which the 1972 National League division champion Pirates play to packed houses. In the fall, the Steelers, last season's sleeper football squad, have their home games there too.

Once a prime candidate for the wreckers' ball, the old Allegheny Post Office, a few blocks from the stadium, has been restored and refurbished and is now home for the Pittsburgh History & Landmarks Museum & Cultural Center. On display are many artifacts of the city's 200-year history.

You'll want to wander through the close-by Mexican War Streets—Buena Vista, Resaca, Palo Alto—historical, residential avenues lined with charmingly restored Victorian homes.

From the number of excellent eating emporiums with outstanding vistas of the city, you get the feeling that Pittsburghers really like looking at their town now that it's all spruced up. Besides having a lofty view of the Highland Park Lock and Dam, particularly lovely in the early evening, The Crow's Nest serves up seafood specialties with flair. The Top of the Triangle, perched at the summit of the new 64-story U.S. Steel Building, provides two spectacular city-scapes, depending upon where you sit. It's open for lunch and dinner and has nightly entertainment in the cocktail lounge.

No visit to Pittsburgh would be complete without a ride up the Monongahela Incline (25 cents each way) to the top of Mount Washington for the Golden Triangle panorama. Just across the Monongahela River the incline's two-minute run brings you to a lofty observation deck. From this vantage point, the Golden Triangle skyline juts up against a backdrop of soft wooded hills, and the

three rivers make their shining way under a series of graceful bridges to meet directly below. It's an incredibly romantic sight at night.

Mount Washington itself has had the benefit of an extensive face-lift, with shops and apartment buildings multiplying like dandelions. Some of Pittsburgh's best restaurants are on the hilltop, and while menus vary, a profusion of windows is standard decor. At Le Mont, the menu is French. Point View serves American and Italian dishes. The Tin Angel serves dinner by reservation only, and then it's always six courses. The Edge is a five-story spatial odyssey with tables stowed on various levels and half floors connected by ramps.

HOME RULE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA

HON. EARL F. LANDGREBE

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. LANDGREBE. Mr. Speaker, I maintain that there has been a lot of talk in the past few months over the issue of home rule in the abstract, while many of us have failed to come to grips with the essential constitutional questions that face the Congress in any consideration of delegation of legislative authority to the District of Columbia government.

Mr. Hayden S. Garber, a former committee counsel of the District of Columbia Committee under Chairman McMillan, has prepared an excellent analysis of the congressional responsibility in the area of legislating for the District of Columbia. He concludes that H.R. 9682 would enact an unconstitutional form of government for the District in that the Congress does not have the authority under the Constitution to delegate such broad legislative authority to a locally elected government.

I commend Mr. Garber's memorandum to the attention of all my colleagues as they prepare for the floor debate on the so-called home rule bill on October 9 and 10:

A MEMORANDUM ON HOME RULE IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA BY HAYDEN S. GARBER

1. The District of Columbia is exclusively a Federal jurisdiction.
2. Any legislative authority exercised over federal or local matters in the District of Columbia is derived solely from the Constitution.
3. The Constitution provides that in the District of Columbia the legislative authority of the Congress shall be "exclusive—in all cases whatsoever . . ."
4. The Constitution makes no provision for the delegation of general legislative authority by the Congress to other branches of the Federal government, to subordinate legislative bodies, to Departments, Commissions, or Agencies of the Federal government nor to any state or local government body.
5. General legislative powers have always been exercised by the Congress, both for the District and for the nation. Courts, including the Supreme Court, have held that the delegation of general legislative power by the Congress exceeded its authority under the Constitution.
6. The legislative authority of the Congress includes the power to issue rules, regulations, and ordinances necessary to make effective enactments of Congress or to dele-

gate such minor legislative power to the executive or judicial branches, to departments, commissions, and agencies of the Federal government or to the local government of the District of Columbia.

7. Since the beginnings of the Federal government under the Constitution, the "minor" legislative authority has been exercised by other than the Congress and to the extent that the Congress permitted. (viz. Code of Federal Regulations.)

8. Since the establishment of the District of Columbia in 1800, the local government has likewise exercised "minor" legislative authority to the extent permitted by the Congress.

9. Article I, Section 8 of the Constitution states the general legislative authority of the Congress. The Article has no language providing for the delegation of any of the general legislative powers given to the Congress by the people. The delegated power and the limitation on that power applies equally to each of the 18 clauses in the Section. No greater power of delegation is provided in the case of the District of Columbia than is provided for levying taxes, coining money, borrowing money, regulating commerce, or declaring war. Any power of delegation applicable—to any one clause is thus equally applicable to any other clause.

10. The pending Home Rule bill proposes that general legislative authority be delegated to the District of Columbia government, except for several specific matters. If this can be done, there is equal validity for proposals to delegate general legislative authority to Federal officials, such as authorizing the Department of Defense or the Cabinet to declare war; the Collector of Internal Revenue to set tax rates; or the Secretary of the Treasury to set the limit on the national debt. If such delegations of general legislative authority are permitted, the Constitution could become a shambles.

LEGAL SUPPORT FOR HOME RULE RESTS MAINLY ON A FEW CONTENTIONS

A. That the Supreme Court has determined that Congress could delegate general legislative authority to the District of Columbia government in its decision in the case of *District of Columbia v. Thompson*, 346 U.S. 100 (1952).

This conclusion is unwarranted. No such determination was made by the Court. The actual findings of law in the case were only—

1. That the District of Columbia local legislature of 1873 had the legislative authority to enact the local regulation prohibiting discrimination in restaurants; and

2. That the regulation of 1873 had survived the changes in government and the revision of the D.C. Code and was valid and effective in 1952.

The Court of Appeals in the *Thompson* case held that the local legislative enactment was "general" legislation and not within the authority of the District of Columbia legislature. The Supreme Court overruled the Appellate Court. The Supreme Court explained that for the purposes of municipal government, the Congress could delegate to the District of Columbia government "full legislative power, subject of course to constitutional limitations..." The Court carefully avoided any suggestion that Congress could delegate "general" legislative power to the District of Columbia or to any other government body or official.

Proponents rely on court dicta and analogies to tease the *Thompson* case into the appearance of support for their contentions. The substance of the opinion is that the Congress can delegate to the District of Columbia such legislative powers as are commonly exercised by municipalities to the extent permitted by the Constitution. The Court used guarded words such as "On the analogy" (if you accept it or if it is a proper

one) "it would seem" that such and such a conclusion might be reached if they are not inconsistent with the Constitution.

The inference, that the term "exclusive" relating to the seat of the national government as provided in the Constitution means only that no state shall exercise any authority, is a conclusion contrary to the history of the clause and to the purpose for which it was devised. The purpose was to assure that the Congress would not be compelled to rely on any other governmental power for its security. The Philadelphia incident in 1783 demonstrated that the federal government could depend on neither a state or local government for protections needed to execute the nation's business.

A delegation of general legislative authority to the District of Columbia government would place the federal establishment in essentially the same predicament that it faced in Philadelphia. Nowhere in the history of the clause or since is there any determination that the intent was that no trust could be placed in the citizens of any state but a complete and unfaltering trust could be placed in the local residents at the seat of the national government. The intent was to permit no element of doubt of federal control.

Home Rule proponents have inflated the applicability of the Courts analogy between the seat of the federal government clause in Article I and the territorial legislative authority in Article IV of the Constitution. They assert that the provisions in Article IV are fully applicable to the District of Columbia. To reach such a conclusion, the established rules of Constitutional construction must be abandoned. Duplication and redundancy is not imputed to the drafters of the Constitution. The analogy is an interesting one. It is not a precise one. The seat of the national government is a *part of the territory* of the United States. But it is *not a territory* of the United States. It is the capital of the nation. The provisions of Article IV, Section 3, give the District of Columbia the same importance as Guam, Puerto Rico or the Virgin Islands.

But the Court explicitly states that in finality, the terms of the Constitution are determinative of the legislative authority of any District of Columbia government. When the rules of construction are applied, Clause 17 of Article I, Section 8, must be given its full meaning and provisions in Article IV cannot modify the full meaning and application of the clause establishing the seat of the national government.

B. That the District of Columbia is capable of exercising "general" legislative power if such power can be delegated by the Congress.

The pending bill asks that the Congress delegate to the District of Columbia government a power which the Congress does not possess. This is a legal impossibility.

The District of Columbia is exclusively a federal jurisdiction. In enacting general legislation for the District, the Congress must take a majority vote from the House and Senate before sending the bill to the President. The Congress cannot delegate to the District legislature the authority to take a majority vote for it on a general bill. Since the Congress cannot achieve enactment into law of general legislation without a majority vote in both Houses, it cannot delegate power to secure lawful enactments without such a vote by the Congress. In any event, it may be noted that the Constitution makes no provision for the President to receive any legislative bills from any legislative body other than the Congress.

C. That Home Rule for the District of Columbia is the same as Home Rule in any community in any of the states. District residents should be given the same privilege.

This over simplified contention ignores several important and significant facts. The impact of Home Rule in a community of

any of the states is essentially limited to the local citizens. The impact of Home Rule in the District of Columbia would be felt by more than 200 million people in the states of the Union.

The conduct of local government is of importance to every citizen of every state. Every taxpayer throughout the nation contributes taxes for the operation of the District government. No other home rule government can extract funds from the people of the nation as does the District of Columbia. The District of Columbia receives the highest per capita federal payments in grants and assistance compared to all other states of the nation. (Example follows)

District of Columbia	\$745
Illinois	158
Indiana	108
Iowa	115
New York	207
Ohio	102
Pennsylvania	137
Virginia	136

(Calculated from "Federal Aid to States, Fiscal 1972—Annual report of Treasury Department, Fiscal Division. Refer—pg. 132 Committee Report on H.R. 9682).

CONCLUSION

In government, the sovereign is that one who possesses supreme authority and may exercise absolute control, subject to none. In the United States, the sovereign is not found in the power of the states, in the national government, in the Constitution or under it—but it is the power which gives substance to it. The sovereign is the people of the United States. The supreme authority is vested in them.

The people of the Confederate States directed their representatives to draft a Constitution for them. This sovereign, in its own name and for its own benefit, defined and delegated powers, and reserved in the absolute the power to amend or repeal any part of the Constitution. Any act, be it by the legislative branch, by the executive branch, or by the judicial branch, so defined and reposed with authority, which changes the duty to or alters the powers reserved to the sovereign, is an act of usurpation.

The Constitution provides the means by which the District of Columbia may secure statehood, general legislative authority, and full authority for local government apart from the federal establishment. Or the local government may continue with its local municipal powers, as an arm of the national government, with its officials selected in such manner as the Congress may approve.

MORE HONORS FOR MICHAEL A. SWEENEY

HON. CHARLES A. VANIK

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. VANIK. Mr. Speaker, on this Saturday, October 6, John Carroll University of my congressional district will be honoring one of Cleveland's finest public servants—who has also been one of its best athletes: Michael A. Sweeney.

In 1946, as a John Carroll University varsity boxer, Mike was a semifinalist light heavyweight in the national collegiate boxing championships. In commemoration of his athletic prowess and ability, Mike is being inducted into the John Carroll University Athletic Hall of Fame during this Saturday's homecoming ceremonies.

It has been my privilege and honor to have Mike as a friend. He has been in the public "ring," fighting the good fight, for years and years. He has practiced law for 21 years and had a distinguished career of service in the Ohio House of Representatives from 1957 through 1966.

I am pleased to join with all of Mike's many Cleveland friends in congratulating him on this new honor.

WBZ AIDS BOSTON'S COMMUTERS

HON. THOMAS P. O'NEILL, JR.

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. O'NEILL. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, we passed the Urban Mass Transportation Act and during the debate there was a great deal of discussion concerning commuting to and from our Nation's large cities. All our cities are faced with air pollution and traffic congestion; now WBZ radio station of Boston has initiated a great service to its city to help alleviate these commuter problems.

Thomas Ehrlich explains and describes this creative service in a recent article in the Wall Street Journal. This service established by WBZ in Boston could also prove to be advantageous to our other cities faced with these same problems:

HERE IS A TERRIFIC IDEA FOR BEATING TRAFFIC: TRY FORMING CAR POOL—BOSTON RADIO STATION UPDATES AN OLD CONCEPT, MATCHING COMMUTERS WITH COMPUTERS

(By Thomas Ehrlich)

BOSTON.—Mary Parker's workdays begin and end in a brutal 58-mile, four-lane, bumper-to-bumper mad rush along Route 128.

So the secretary signed up fast when radio station WBZ told her she could join a "commuter computer clubcar" to share the driving, save money and even have fun on her drive between her home in Plymouth and the Chevron oil office in Waltham where she works. "Maybe I won't be talking to myself all the time," says Mrs. Parker.

WBZ figures there are many, many traffic-weary Mary Parkers among the 300,000 commuters who clog the highways around Boston every rush hour—nearly all of them driving alone. So the station dusted off an old idea, the car pool, jazzed it up a bit and came up with a public-service promotion whose success so far has startled even WBZ and its parent, Westinghouse Broadcasting Co.

Some 20,000 motorists have picked up "clubcar" applications at tunnel toll booths in the four weeks since WBZ announcers overcame their initial inability to say "commuter computer clubcar" quickly and began plugging it at least twice an hour. Another 5,800 commuters have written to the station for applications. Stores, restaurants and offices have begun handing out applications, and by mid-October, WBZ expects to have over a million applications in the hands of motorists.

LIKE COMPUTER DATING

The clubcar system works sort of like a computerized dating service. Those who fill out applications will be matched with other commuters who live nearby and work similar hours. Each applicant will receive up to 10 names of others making similar commutes, and it will be up to them to get together and form their own car pools.

Just how many people actually will pool

their rush-hour tedium when the match-ups start going into the mail later this month is anyone's guess. But WBZ and its partner in the scheme, the regional ALA Auto & Travel Club (formerly the Automobile Legal Association) have high hopes—as do state and federal pollution agencies.

"We think car pools will become a basic mode of transportation" in the Boston area until planned mass-transit improvements are completed around 1978, says John McGlenon, who heads the regional Environmental Protection Agency office. The federal agency and the Massachusetts Department of Transportation have been toiling for months on a master plan to reduce auto traffic and cut pollution, and they had considered such drastic measures as banning cars from the city one day a week and closing some downtown parking lots. Just this month, Gov. Francis Sargent unveiled a broad transit plan that relies heavily on car pools and may eventually include such inducements as special expressway lanes reserved for cars with more than one occupant.

The EPA figures that if just 55,000 Boston commuters formed car pools, the average rush-hour ridership would rise to 1.5 persons a car from 1.1 currently. That alone would enable Boston to meet the federal pollution rules due to go into effect in 1977. "We wouldn't have a need for any further transportation strategy," Mr. McGlenon asserts.

"We were there at the right time with the right idea," says Jerry Wishnow, WBZ's 29-year-old "director of creative services." He decided transportation was the issue this year. Last year WBZ's public-affairs promotion was a "Shape Up Boston" campaign for dieting, exercise and nutrition.

SYMBOL: A 1938 PONTIAC

Getting commuters into car pools won't be easy, as even the ebullient Mr. Wishnow concedes. "Car pools seem pedestrian," he says. Hence the name clubcar, which WBZ plugs as a "special place for friends to gather on the long ride to work. . . . Part of a forgotten era."

The clubcar symbol is a 1938 Pontiac touring car with a relaxed driver and with six passengers sipping coffee and chatting in the back. "It's a whole new way to get to work," promises a two-page ad in the regional edition of Time magazine. And on the air, personalities ranging from weatherman Don Kent to kiddie show host Rex Traller hammer away at the theme "the best way to keep up with the Joneses is to ride in the same car."

The clubcar sponsors are working on other inducements, besides the \$500 a year they estimate the average motorist can save by riding in a car pool of four persons. WBZ has visions of ultimately arranging free downtown shuttle-bus service, reduced parking rates and even cut-rate shopping and free coffee for clubcar riders, plus a free phone service to give them how-to-get-around Boston advice anytime of the day or night.

THE 365TH ANNIVERSARY OF POLISH IMMIGRATION

HON. MARTHA W. GRIFFITHS

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, October 3, 1973

Mrs. GRIFFITHS. Mr. Speaker, when most people think of Polish immigration to America, they remember the waves of immigrants from eastern and central Europe during the early part of this century. However, Poles were among the first Europeans to seek a future in the new world. On October 1, 1608, a small

band of Polish craftsmen landed in Jamestown, Va. These men had been hired by the Virginia Colony to instruct the colonists in the manufacture of glass, tar, and other products to be exported to England. They built the first factory in the United States, as well as the first saw-mill, and taught the Jamestown settlers to make soap and building materials. Through their efforts, they helped insure the survival of the first English settlement in North America.

In the past 365 years, Poles and Polish Americans have made a continuing contribution to the Nation. They have fought in all our wars and have made achievements in government, industry, the arts and sciences, and education. It is fitting that we commemorate the arrival of our first Polish citizens, as we reflect on the efforts of those who followed them.

ALFRED HUGHES—A SELF-TAUGHT MAN

HON. RON DE LUGO

OF THE VIRGIN ISLANDS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DE LUGO. Mr. Speaker, I have here an interesting story about a man whose desire for knowledge has not been impeded by his lack of formal education. I think my colleagues will be interested in the story of Alfred Hughes, "Nazo," as he is known in the Virgin Islands.

He is a man who loves to learn, but grew up when formal education was hard to come by in the Virgin Islands. He has a natural talent for veterinary medicine, and had served the island community from the 1920's until the first licensed veterinarian, Miss Rikki Von Decken Leurs, came to St. Thomas in the 1940's.

He has never charged anyone for his services, and has taught himself all he knew, including the technique of writing prescriptions.

But that is not all, this man's desire for knowledge has led him to several careers during his 63 years. He learned electrical work and made it his occupation until 1964. He learned plumbing and offered his services during the same time to many members of the community. He was also a captain for a small marine vessel operating out of St. Thomas, and in his free time he was a jockey, a boxer, a long-distance swimmer, and a tennis player.

His full life and his experiences as described in the following news article could make us wish we had his advantages:

NAZO'S FIRST LOVE—HORSES

(By Jackie Petrillo)

A man never forgets his first love, but Alfred Hughes ("Nazarene") has not only remembered his, but has been faithful for a lifetime. The affection and gratitude he receives in return are unwavering. You say this eternal kind of love doesn't exist in our day and age? It does in the case of "Nazarene" and his first love—horses.

"Nazo", St. Thomas' self-taught veterinarian has loved horses and all animals ever since he was a young boy. Born in 1910, he was hoping to be a jockey by the 1920's. But

he wanted to be able to take good care of the horses he rode and studied everything he could get his hands on to learn how. When the time came that his ambition to be a jockey was fulfilled and he rode horses at the Sugar Estate racetrack, for trainers, he could cure them of diseases and treat their injuries.

In the past 15 years he's achieved another goal—to work in a salaried job doing the thing he loves best, treating sick animals. "Nazo", now 63, has been classified a technician for the past 15 years, assisting veterinary doctors as they go about their rounds treating all kinds of sick animals, first out of the veterinary office at the old hospital and, for the past year, at the new veterinary center at the Agriculture Station, in Dorothia. He's often taken over when the doctors have been away.

"NAZO" PROVED HIMSELF

Before 1958, he worked at any and all jobs to earn money and studied veterinary medicine on his own, treating any animal in need of help whenever he was consulted, without payment. He says that since he was too poor to go to college, he had to prove his worth by the results he achieved. This was the method he'd used since childhood, for establishing a reputation on the island.

Nazo came from a poor family and his father died when he was nine years old. By the age of 14, he had to quit school, to help his mother care for four younger sisters. He had gone only as far as eighth grade. To help out at home, he would work as an errand boy, or wash dishes and serve table for \$2 a month. "It was rough," he remembers. We were so glad when we got a dime to keep. We would happily sit on the corner eating peanuts. I had to give my whole salary to my mother."

Whenever he got a chance, Alfred (the nickname came later) would go to the slaughter house to learn more about the anatomy of animals. He had a few dogs of his own and would read animal care books to learn how to cure them of any ailments. Friends noticed how good he was at treating his own puppies and would ask his advice. "I had to prove my worth to them," he says. Gradually, word spread that Alfred, though he was only a boy, was one person to consult if your animal was sick. "People were skeptical," he explains. "It was hard, but I did the best I could."

NO VETS IN THOSE DAYS

In the 1920's there were no vets on the island. A few individuals had earned a reputation for knowledge about treatment methods for animals, but they learned on their own. Wilfred Monsanto, who managed Tutu estate, learned from Dr. Viggo Christensen, a medical doctor who lived on the estate. John Lindqvist learned on his own by treating the animals on his St. John plantations. But other than these few people, animal owners were at a loss for what to do to cure sick animals. Only an occasional visiting veterinarian was otherwise available.

Alfred would go to the pharmacy and beg the pharmacists to give him medicine, although he had no "doctor's certificate."

Gradually, they too realized the young man knew what he was doing. He would write the "prescription" by consulting medical books. By the time the first resident veterinarian, Miss Rikki von Decken Leurs came to St. Thomas in the late 1940's, Alfred had been practicing veterinary medicine, without asking for any payment, for more than 20 years.

HOW HE GOT NICKNAME

It was through a horse he rode, logically enough, that "Nazo" got his nickname. He rode one horse in races at Sugar Estate

called "Nazarene". Gerard Berne, one of "Nazo's" old friends says, "People would shout 'Nazarene! Nazarene! Come een! Come Een!', but he didn't." The horse wasn't a winner, but his name was and it stuck to him, later to be shortened to "Nazo."

JACK OF ALL TRADES

As the years went by, "Nazo" learned many trades and became an all round athlete, but still preferred jockeying and treating animals. "I did anything for a living, but I loved animals," he remembers.

He learned electrical work under apprenticeship to Excelman ("Selly") DeLagarde and then went on to be a jack of all trades for Emile Berne's ice company from 1938-1964.

Gerald Berne, Emile's son, still in his father's business, says "You had to have your finger in every pie in those days to make a dollar," and the company not only manufactured ice, but was agent for several shipping lines, ran a charter fishing boat and trained racehorses too.

"Nazo" fit neatly into all aspects of the business. Starting out at a \$8 a week salary in 1938, he was an apt pupil. He learned plumbing in order to repair plant equipment, mechanics, to repair broken down delivery trucks and of course refrigeration.

"I loved that place," says Nazo. "It was a regular training school. I learned everything there." Since the company operated a fishing boat, who should become its captain but "Nazo." He also ran the motor boat that towed loaded barges. Once, during the meat shortage of 1945, caused by the war, he transported 2,000 pounds of meat from St. Croix to St. Thomas.

COMPANY JOCKEY

In addition, in his "spare time" Nazo was the company jockey and treated the horses they trained. He stayed with the company for 26 years, before he was able to get a full time paid job as a veterinarian's assistant. And he was their jockey until he put on too much weight to ride anymore.

In his free time, not only was he a jockey, on his own horses, but a boxer, long-distance swimmer and tennis player, at the Altona club.

GROWING INTEREST

Now, although his athletic participation has ebbed, his interest in learning about veterinary medicine has increased, if anything. "The trouble is that animals can't talk," says Nazo. "You've got to use a lot of brain to find out what's wrong with them."

Working in the government veterinary service, part-time in 1958 under Luther Fahlund up to his present full-time job under Dr. Charles Saunders, Nazo has continued to develop his brain. "Now is when you have to study," he states. "If you don't keep up, you can't make it."

Naturally, it isn't only one job he does. On weekends he operates "Alfred Hughes' Clinic for Bathing and Clipping," a licensed dog grooming salon, from his Soto town home. The most frequent customers are French poodles.

I LIKE EVERYTHING MODERN

How does he feel about all of the changes, not only in veterinary medicine, but in the way of life in St. Thomas? "I like everything modern," he says. "We've got to forget the good old days. They're gone. We had only the wind-up phonograph then and now we can see things nearly the same time as they happen all over the world, on television."

He's prepared to cope with the modern world without losing his devotion to all that was good in the past. "They still call me any time of the night if an animal has an accident," he says. "I do whatever I can to help."

DR. JAMES W. HOLT, JR., WINS TRAVEL WRITERS AWARD

HON. FERNAND J. ST GERMAIN

OF RHODE ISLAND

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. ST GERMAIN. Mr. Speaker, in September, during its 18th annual meeting in Rapid City, S. Dak., the Society of American Travel Writers announced that its "Connie" Award will be given to six winners who have made "outstanding contributions to a quality travel environment through conservation and preservation," and I am proud to say that one of the six is my constituent, Dr. James W. Holt, Jr., of Tiverton, R.I.

The story behind Dr. Holt's contribution is remarkable and, since I feel sure my colleagues will agree that it warrants telling, I take pleasure in inserting some of the interesting facts that the Society of American Travel Writers included in a citation accompanying the "Connie" Award:

Fort Barton, in Tiverton, Rhode Island, has been restored to its historic appearance as a key Continental defense station against British-held Newport during the American Revolution. In addition to presenting once again its former architectural and aesthetic appeal, the fort is now an important tourist attraction, wildlife preserve, and recreational area.

In the 1930's, Fort Barton was overgrown and neglected. It was owned by the Newport Historical Society, but no funds were available to permit its preservation. The deterioration of the fort continued. During World War II, an air spotters' tower was erected atop the bluffs which constitute the principal overlook area of the fort. But, after it was no longer needed, the tower also fell into disrepair and the site continued to decline.

Before the fort passed the point of no return, a champion appeared in the person of Dr. James W. Holt, Jr., a dentist from Tiverton. Dr. Holt recognized the feeling among the people of Tiverton that the fort should be preserved, and because he was aware that no leader was willing to assume the monumental chore that would undoubtedly be required to insure a successful effort, he singlehandedly took on this task himself. Quietly, and with the characteristic determination of a New Englander, Dr. Holt began to develop a plan to interest local, state and national officials in Fort Barton.

Perhaps the most trying phase involved attraction of public funds, which necessitated working through various bureaus governing state and national programs. Only constant tracking of this proposal through each office along the way could have brought success, and Dr. Holt devoted daytime hours as well as many nights to this purpose. Often he adjusted his professional schedule and dental appointments to allow meeting with officials to further the project. He developed a synchronized slide and narration program that helped immensely, but increased the demands upon his time because of the growing popularity of the program.

Finally, funds were made available to the project and Dr. Holt's campaign was won. Fort Barton is now recognized by the State of Rhode Island as one of its major scenic and historic attractions, and credit for this project will always stand as a monument to the dedicated leadership of the Tiverton dentist, Dr. James W. Holt, Jr.

Mr. Leonard J. Panaggio, chief of the Tourist Promotion Division of the Rhode

Island Development Council, and a member of the Society of American Travel Writers, submitted Dr. Holt's work for the consideration of the Conservation Committee of the society, and the award will be presented to Dr. Holt in an appropriate local ceremony in the near future.

The society's president, Mr. Alfred S. Borcover, who is associate travel editor of the Chicago Tribune, has expressed the hope that the awards will "stimulate other organizations and individuals to help protect the world's areas of natural beauty, the wildernesses, the unspoiled beaches, the historic sites, and the old world treasures that travelers travel to see."

In March 1973, Fort Barton was entered in the National Register of Historic Places, and for this Americans will always be indebted to Dr. Holt.

JOSEPH L. MUSCARELLE AND
CHARLES MARCIANTE HONORED

HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, on Sunday, October 7, the annual New Jersey Columbian Foundation dinner will pay tribute to two outstanding individuals, men whom I have known and with whom I have worked closely for many years—Charles H. Marcianite, president of the New Jersey AFL-CIO, and Joseph L. Muscarelle, president of Joseph L. Muscarelle, Inc.

The Columbian Foundation is a non-profit charitable organization founded in 1941 by business and professional men in the metropolitan area of Newark and the surrounding counties of New Jersey. The objectives of the foundation are dedicated to improve the cultural, educational, economic, and social welfare of our region.

It is indeed fitting that both these men are to be honored at the Columbian Foundation's "Columbus Day Award Dinner." We remember Columbus as a man who fought tenaciously, because he wanted to find the truth and make it triumph. We regard him as a great pioneer personifying the spirit of discovery and embodying the will to overcome insurmountable odds. Particularly at a time in our history when we are confronted by challenges from all sides, at a time when the very principles of justice, trust, and honor upon which our Nation was founded are tested ever so strongly, a resurgence of the Columbian spirit which stirred that Genoese navigator ever onward in his quest for a new world is a most vital need.

The contributions of Charles H. Marcianite to the economic and social welfare of our State, the strength, courage, and leadership he has brought to the labor movement, truly have left their imprint on the progressive development of equality and fair labor standards for all our people. Joseph Muscarelle's commitment

to assuring that every man and woman be given the basic right to health, happiness, and personal fulfillment have been demonstrated time and again through his generosity, sensitivity, and understanding. The Columbian spirit truly has not diminished since Columbus' fleet found port on our shores; the spirit, instead has grown and rekindled and taken particular renaissance at this moment in our history. I am indeed proud that Messrs. Muscarelle and Marcianite have given so very much of themselves to the people of New Jersey. May their good works continue for many years to come.

WALL STREET JOURNAL REVIEWS PROPOSALS BY SELECT COMMITTEE ON COMMITTEES

HON. WILLIAM S. MOORHEAD

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. MOORHEAD of Pennsylvania. Mr. Speaker, John Pierson, writing in Wednesday's Wall Street Journal, has produced an excellent article on the work of our colleague DICK BOLLING and the Select Committee on Committees.

Whatever the final decision, there is one fact that I know we all agree on, and that was the choice of DICK BOLLING to head the effort.

An author of two excellent books on the House and its idiosyncrasies, DICK BOLLING and his committee have undertaken a herculean task for which there will be little thanks.

I for one would like to salute each member of that special unit for their work to date.

At this time I also would like to put John Pierson's article in the RECORD for the information of my colleagues.

[From the Wall Street Journal, Oct. 3, 1973]

DOES THE HOUSE NEED MAJOR SURGERY?

(By John Pierson)

WASHINGTON.—Dick Bolling and nine of his brother Congressmen are trying to decide whether to tear up the whole pea patch or just rearrange a few rows.

The pea patch is the House of Representatives. Rep. Bolling's license to mess around with it is House Resolution 132, which created a committee to study committees.

Sounds harmless. But it isn't.

That's because most of Congress' work—spotting problems and drafting bills to deal with them—is done in committees. The floor debates and votes are just the mustard on the hotdog.

Mess with committees and you're messing with power—lean, raw, power. Dick Bolling knows that (he's been around Congress since 1949), but he cares enough about the House to think it worth a try.

H.R. 132 called for a "thorough and complete" study of a lot of things: How many committees should there be? How many members should sit on each committee? How many subcommittees should a committee have? What rules, procedures, press coverage, staffing, space and equipment are right for committees?

But the "meanest" area of all, as the Missouri Democrat sees it, is jurisdiction; Which committee should deal with which problem? Who gets what turf?

For some House members, notably the chairmen of the House's 21 standing committees, the only thing wrong with the way the turf is arranged now is that they don't have enough of it. But for a lot of other less fortunate members the turf has grown ragged.

Hearings before Rep. Bolling's Select Committee on Committees have turned up two main complaints about jurisdiction. One, some committees are overworked, while others have little to do. The Education and Labor Committee handled 542 separate bills in the past Congress; the Internal Security Committee handled only eight.

Two, some urgent problems—the environment, energy, transportation—are split up among several committees and so are never dealt with as a whole. For example, at least five House committees have a piece of transportation. Public Works has jurisdiction over highways, Commerce over airlines and intercity railroads, Banking and Currency over mass transit, Merchant Marine and Fisheries over waterway transportation, and Ways and Means over trust funds that pay for certain transportation programs.

The solution, say the critics, is clear: rearrange the work load in a way that gives one Congressman as much to do as another and that permits a more organized attack on the nation's ills.

FROM TRANSFUSION TO TRACHEOTOMY

Specific proposals range from the bold to the timid. Chairman Bolling, for example, has given his nine brethren copies of "An Exercise in Planning the House of Representatives" that calls for collapsing the present 21 standing committees into eight; budget, economics, human resources, natural resources and environment, national policy planning, internal affairs and defense, intergovernmental and legislative branch policy and management.

But this kind of radical surgery would upset not only 21 committee chairmen but also 21 ranking Republican members (would-be chairmen all) 128 subcommittee chairmen and their 128 opposite Republican members. It would scare every agency of the Executive Branch that's developed a cozy relationship with a House committee and every vested interest group with a committee in its pocket.

"It would make," acknowledged Rep. Bolling, "damn near everybody insecure." Abolish all committees and alter all jurisdictions?" muses Rep. Robert Stephens of Georgia, the committee's number-two Democrat, "you might as well throw the proposal out in the street and let the rain wash it down the drain."

A more practical solution would be to inject enough jurisdictional change to do some good but not so much as to stir up all the House's anti-bodies. The committee has not begun to reach a practical consensus, but some of the members have their pet ideas.

Chairman Bolling, for one, would like to split the Education and Labor Committee in two, lodge the energy problem in a single panel, and move the foreign trade issue from Ways and Means to Foreign Affairs.

Breaking up the busy Education and Labor Committee has been proposed before. But in the past, the idea has always run aground on the shoals of organized labor.

Until this year, the committee's second-ranking Democrat was Oregon's Edith Green, no friend of labor. Since Rep. Green stood to chair a separate labor committee, the AFL-CIO opposed the split. Now that Mrs. Green has moved to the Appropriations Committee, Frank Thompson of New Jersey has first dibs at the chairmanship of a separate labor panel. And labor likes Rep. Thompson.

But not every member of the Committee on Committees agrees with Chairman Bolling that divorcing education from labor is a good idea. William Steiger, a Wisconsin Republi-

can, says it would go against nature to separate, for example, vocational education from manpower training.

Since Chairman Bolling will want to confront the House with a unanimous report, Rep. Steiger's opposition could undo the unseaming of Education and Labor.

Lack of unanimity could also kill Rep. Bolling's idea of taking foreign trade away from Ways and Means and giving it to the Foreign Affairs Committee. Several witnesses argued that with trade, taxes, Social Security and other responsibilities, Ways and Means has too much to do. Its overwork problem is aggravated, they said, by Chairman Wilbur Mills' refusal to divide his committee into subcommittees, one of which could study taxes while another studied trade and a third looked at Social Security.

Since the tariff is no longer the government's main source of revenue and since trade affects this country's relations with other countries, it makes sense to give trade to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

But not, apparently, to Chairman Mills. He didn't even respond to Chairman Bolling's invitation to testify on committee reform. And if the Arkansas Democrat's back mends and he elects to stay in Congress, he could be expected to put up a real fight to hold onto his empire. Dave Martin, the Nebraska Republican who's vice chairman of the Bolling Committee, indulges in a bit of understatement when he says: "I can't see Wilbur Mills giving up any piece of his jurisdiction, at least not voluntarily."

If Rep. Mills retires, the dismemberment of Ways and Means might be easier to accomplish. (The same goes for any of the House's aging chairmen—men like Wright Patman of Banking and Currency, Chet Holifield of Government Operations and Ray Madden of Rules. One chairman, William Jennings Bryan Dorn, of the Veterans' Affairs Committee, may quit to run for governor of South Carolina.)

Chairman Bolling offers a sweetener of sorts for Ways and Means: Give up trade and we'll give you food stamps and other income-maintenance programs to go with Social Security.

But talk of sweeteners and trade-offs may be empty unless Rep. Bolling can convince the other nine members of his committee that trading away the trade bill from Ways and Means makes sense. Rep. Stephens, for one, thinks it doesn't. For him, the tariff is still a revenue-raiser and thus a matter for the Revenue Committee. Rep. Steiger thinks Ways and Means has done "an excellent job" with trade legislation.

Then there's Rep. Bolling's proposal for laying the energy crisis on one committee. The idea is logical and neat. But anyway you do it, it spells trouble.

A brand new energy committee would open up new chairmanships and avoid the seniority hassles that occur when jurisdictions are moved between existing committees. But a new committee that really wanted to come to grips with the energy problem would have to steal big hunks of jealously-guarded jurisdiction from Interior, Commerce, Public Works, Atomic Energy, Science and Astronautics, and even Ways and Means.

What's more, environmentalists might join oilmen, coal miners and other power people in opting for the chaotic status quo, on the theory that a divided energy lobby is more often beatable than a united one.

When all is said and done, then, it may well be that the Committee on Committees won't be able to come up with any workable plan for changing jurisdictions. Some face could be saved, however, by another pet Bolling idea: a mechanism for taking a fresh look at jurisdictions and other committee matters every two years.

THE 1946 OPERATION

The most recent major overhaul of jurisdictions was in 1946, when the House col-

lapsed 48 standing committees (including the Committee on Invalid Pensions) into 19. The reform was more apparent than real, though, since it led to a proliferation of subcommittees.

"We all figured out ways of being called 'Mr. Chairman' anyway," say Chairman Bolling.

Changing jurisdictions more often than once every quarter century could make the change less drastic and less painful. Rep. Bolling thinks the Joint Senate-House Committee on Congressional Operations might take the responsibility of making recommendations every other year.

Changes in procedure may be easier for the House to swallow than jurisdictional change. Procedural changes the Bolling Committee might recommend include early organization of a new Congress, right after the election, to give the lawmakers a running start in January; an end to proxy voting in committee, which can give a member a good attendance record but a poor grasp of the issues; limiting each member to one committee and three or four subcommittees to make him more expert; and joint hearings by two or more committees where jurisdictions overlap.

But will the House accept any change? The committee's effort has the support of Speaker Carl Albert, who'd like to cut down the power of barons like Rep. Mills. It has the support of Minority Leader Gerald Ford, who likes the fact that membership and staff of the Bolling Committee are divided equally between Republicans and Democrats, an unusual arrangement.

But whether the leadership can carry the day against the barons and the normal inertia of the House remains to be seen. For one thing the House has done a lot of reforming of late. Committee chairmen, whose seniority used to assure them of their jobs, are now subject to confirmation by the Democratic Caucus. Formerly closed meetings are now open. Subcommittee chairmen have received more authority to act independently of their committee chairman.

And now the House is wrestling with reform of its budget procedures and election reform. By the time Rep. Bolling brings his proposals to the floor next spring, the members may have grown sick of trying to better themselves.

And then there's always the appeal of doing nothing. One proponent of leaving things alone is Rep. Joe Waggonner, a Louisiana Democrat, a member of Ways and Means and head of a group of conservative House members called the Democratic Research Organization.

"I don't think what we're doing is as bad as some people think," declares Rep. Waggonner. "I've spent my time in the House trying to learn this system and then using it. If other members would do the same, they might not be so anxious to tear it up."

YOUNG ADULTS HAVE FAITH IN GOVERNMENT OFFICIALS

HON. WILLIAM F. WALSH

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. WALSH. Mr. Speaker, every once in a while in the life of a public official, he receives a communication that makes all the trials and tribulations he sometimes experiences seem all worthwhile. Such an event occurred last week when I received a letter from a group of young people associated with the Owasco Reformed Church in Owasco, N.Y., in which they expressed faith and confidence in

our governmental representatives during these troubled times.

I feel this unique occurrence is sufficiently worthy to call to the attention of all my colleagues. I know it will offer the same sense of comfort to you that it has to me as we continue to face the great responsibilities that lie ahead.

The communication follows:

OWASCO, N.Y., September 20, 1973.

Representative WILLIAM F. WALSH,
Syracuse, N.Y.

DEAR SIR: We are a group of Christians from the Owasco Reformed Church in America in Owasco, New York. For the past few weeks our "Young Adult and Teen" Class has been discussing current issues in regard to our governmental policies. Even among ourselves we are not in agreement on issues such as Vietnam, the bombing of Cambodia, and Watergate.

We are not proposing any solutions to these or any of the other problems. Our purpose of this letter is to express confidence in our governmental representatives during these "troubled times". We would like you to know we are for our government officials.

"Remind your people to obey the government and its officers, and always to be obedient and ready for any honest work."—Titus 3:1 The Living New Testament.

Sincerely,

(Signed by Lois Webster and 22 other signatures.)

PROTECTION OF PEACE

HON. EDWIN B. FORSYTHE

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. FORSYTHE. Mr. Speaker, the Hon. Jerry W. Friedheim, Assistant Secretary of Defense for Public Affairs, on September 17 presented a speech in which he discusses the administration's concern for the maintenance of an effective defense during this sensitive era of negotiation.

Since Mr. Friedheim's remarks were presented at Cherry Hill, N.J., which is located within the district that I represent, and since they clearly illustrate DOD's concern in this area, I thought it would be appropriate to share them with my colleagues.

Mr. Friedheim's remarks follow:

U.S. NATIONAL SECURITY POLICY BEYOND VIETNAM: THE PROMOTION AND PROTECTION OF PEACE

It's a pleasure for me to be here tonight. This first visit of mine with you here in this forum comes at a time when our nation also is for the first time in many years free from the painful challenge of overseas war.

Our nation now has, as the President has said: "the magnificent opportunity to play the leading role in bringing down the walls of hostility which divide the people of the world."

In fact, we can now look forward to being engaged not in war but in the greater task of building a stable world peace.

As you know, the last four years have been years of transition: from war to peace; from a wartime economy to a peacetime economy; from a federal budget dominated by defense expenditures to one dominated by human resource expenditures; from arms competition to arms limitation; and from a draft-dominated military force toward an all-volunteer force.

Now, this transition period is just about over, and we are moving further away from

an era of confrontation and further into an era of negotiation. So now our national task is to marshal our resources and to help guarantee that world stability and peace—once achieved—can be maintained.

President Nixon has emphasized that the post-World War II period of international relations is over.

He has made it the task of his Administration to shape a modern foreign policy addressed to the challenges and requirements of a new era—an era of peace, achieved and preserved through the application of U.S. strength, partnership, and a willingness to negotiate.

U.S. combat involvement in the long and difficult war in Indochina is over.

A quarter-century of mutual isolation and distrust between the U.S. and the Peoples Republic of China is ending.

In the past four years, more significant agreements have been reached with the Soviet Union than in all previous years—including initial arms limitation agreements.

In company with our overseas friends and allies—with whom we share strong convictions about the proper relationships of governments and of men—we are now pursuing the goal of a lasting peace.

We are not abandoning our treaty commitments. But, the meeting of our commitments does not require the United States to play the role of world policeman.

Instead, it requires that we have the capacity and the will to contribute to and help sustain an international structure of security, stability, partnership and cooperation.

The United States will do everything reasonable to help achieve lasting peace, utilizing our own strength as necessary and exercising our Security Assistance Program to help others help themselves. But our hopes and desires for peace cannot be allowed to obscure our view of a real world that is almost incredibly complex.

It's true that many changes have occurred in the Communist world in recent decades. Its monolithic structure has changed, and nationalism has gained strength.

It is quite correct that we take these changes into account in formulating our national security policies. It also is both correct and essential that, in planning our military forces, we have before us a careful, clear calculation of the capabilities of those in this world who may not always wish us well. And, at present, the major nuclear threat still is from the Soviet Union.

Our relations with the USSR do appear promising, and—if we keep our eyes open and our wits about us—the odds are fair that we and they can avoid slipping back into the intense hostility which made the last two decades so dangerous. The Soviets' conclusion of the SALT I agreements confirm that they are at least somewhat interested in considering arms control. Further and more lasting limitations on both U.S. and Soviet strategic, offensive armament may be achieved through SALT II talks this fall.

But, at the same time, the Soviets have made very significant gains in missile and naval power and are continuing to build up their overall military strength. For instance, they are building four new types of multiple-warhead intercontinental missiles and two aircraft carriers.

While this does not mean that an imminent danger to the United States necessarily is being created, the need for prudence and for attention to real Soviet capabilities is obvious.

The adversary aspects of U.S.-Soviet relations still are very real and can have serious security dimensions.

For example, in some areas of the world, the Soviets are undertaking diplomatic and economic penetration efforts of major proportions. Their purposes probably include attempts to enhance their great-power status, to acquire political influence, to gain improved access to raw materials, and in

the longer run, to complement their maritime expansion through base and port access overseas.

Furthermore, the Soviets demonstrate few compunctions about creating or capitalizing on international instability when they can do so at low cost and low risk.

So, the physical defense of our nation and our allies must remain of high priority, because destruction or domination would render any of our other values and goals meaningless; and we must also secure the way we live from coercion and from undue, unwanted influence by others.

So my friends, the purpose of our defense forces in the last quarter of the 20th century is more than just the prevention of war: it is the promotion and protection of peace. And the best way to promote peace is to keep our guard up even as we outstretch the hand of cooperation and friendship.

The goal of U.S. foreign policy—supported by the U.S. defense policy—is to build a framework of peace for the United States and the world.

We are not involved in the world because we have overseas interests; rather, we have overseas interests because we are involved in the world.

We couldn't be uninvolved even if we wanted to. Neo-isolationism is not simply a mistake. It is an impossibility.

It is beyond reality to think that the United States could withdraw from the world, live in isolation, and live in peace. For one thing, the United States is no longer, as it once was, self-sufficient in energy.

During the present decade, the world will consume more oil than it has in all previous centuries, and here in the United States alone, we consume over 15 million barrels of oil a day in satisfying only half of our consumer demands for energy.

Two-thirds of this 15-million-barrel daily requirement now is produced domestically, and one-third is imported, primarily from Canada and South America. It is estimated that in only a dozen years, U.S. oil requirements will expand from today's 15 to about 26 million barrels a day; and we will need to import at least half of it.

Even the oil discoveries in Alaska are insufficient to allow us to keep pace with our demand.

While we may learn to practice some conservation measures in coming years, it still is likely that the only countries which can produce sufficient oil to meet Free World demands in 1985 are the countries of the Middle East and North Africa, where we find 70 percent of the world's known petroleum reserves.

Even today, Western Europe is dependent upon Arabian oil for more than 50 percent of its needs in meeting energy requirements. Japan is at least 90 percent dependent on that same source.

These figures highlight only one facet of the world's energy problem, but the strategic, political, economic, and military implications of world petroleum supply and demand are enough—all alone—to indicate that nations are inter-dependently involved in the areas of the world where vital interests are at stake.

By the year 2000, more than half of the raw materials we need will have to come from abroad. How then, can this nation—so dependent on worldwide resources for its economic vitality and strength—disclaim worldwide interests?

The answer is, we cannot.

So the Nixon Doctrine foreign policy and our supporting defense policies are not ways to retreat into isolation. Instead, they are ways we can continue to participate in and to influence world affairs in the 1970s and 1980s without doing all the jobs and paying all the bills and making all the decisions ourselves.

But, let us always remember that the ability of our nation to pursue a generation of peace—through the process of negotiation—

depends upon our maintaining strong armed forces.

We are today the strongest nation in the world; but, even now it is a world in which we cannot have absolute security. We must live indefinitely with risk. And so the peace we seek is based on the realities of the world.

Our national security and foreign policies seek to establish for the United States an international role that encourages an environment in which negotiation really can become the overwhelmingly dominant means of resolving conflicts.

Especially for a strong nation, willingness to negotiate stems from a conviction that peace is in the best interest of all nations and that the less strong have legitimate rights and claims in the international arena just as do the very powerful. The United States has accepted those kinds of responsibilities. We enter an era of negotiation not expecting that violence has been eradicated, but hoping that conditions can be created where negotiated adjustment of differences will offer more useful solutions than war.

Clearly, we cannot negotiate a significant reduction of world tensions in the United States by any unilateral disarmament creates vacuums in the international structure of security—vacuums that lead to disequilibrium, to a temptation for adversaries to exploit a perceived advantage—vacuums that could lead ultimately to the self-defeat of American objectives.

And so, the free world maintains defense forces to assure that the scales of international ambition are balanced for peaceful competition.

The principle is a simple, human one—as applicable on the schoolyard as in the world arena: unbalanced strength is destabilizing. It tempts conflict, and invites intimidation. Balanced strength leaves talk and negotiation the only viable option toward resolving differences.

If the United States expects in our negotiations to be taken seriously by our adversaries and our allies, then we must have strength as we bargain.

If we should try to settle differences with other countries under circumstances of military inferiority, we would experience great pressure to reach agreements more favorable to our adversary than to us. It is only by maintaining a strong defense posture that we ensure our interests and objectives will be adequately respected and that we can negotiate by choice, not from coercion.

This military strength of ours must be adequate not only in fact, but it must be perceived as such by friends, neutrals, and potential enemies.

Other nations base their policies toward the U.S., at least in part, on their evaluation of our military capabilities. Therefore, we must exhibit continual determination to maintain a sufficient level of modern, capable armed forces.

The question really is: How do you go about promoting peace from where we are now? And, the approach of the United States is that you do it through patient, piece-by-piece negotiations—negotiations for which we are well prepared, knowing where we might compromise and where we dare not compromise.

These careful negotiations involve two goals: an attempt to reduce situations of world tension as in Berlin or the Middle East; and an attempt to limit arms as in the SALT talks and the coming talks on possible force reductions in Europe.

And when we are thinking about how you get there from here, it should be clear that we are dealing in a very tough negotiating situation. Just think for a minute about who the people are who head the governments with which we are negotiating.

There is Brezhnev and the members of the Soviet Presidium; there is Mao and Chou En-Lai and the other aging leaders of the Peoples Republic of China whose memory, whose active experience, goes back to the Long

March. These are people who will not give us anything, for nothing. They will not bargain with us unless we have something to bargain with.

Sometimes these days we think wishfully about how much the peoples of the world have in common—human aspirations, human problems, human satisfactions.

And we feel that there surely is goodwill of peoples toward each other.

There may be such goodwill and, if relations between nations really were relations between peoples, then perhaps we already would have worldwide peace.

But the fact is that this is not the way in which relations between nations are conducted. They are relations between governments.

So when we bargain with the Soviet Union or the Peoples Republic of China, we are not dealing with 250 million Russians or 800 million Chinese. We are dealing with the handful of very tough-minded individuals who, over a long history, have fought their way to the top of these Communist governmental systems.

You just cannot achieve agreements with such leaders unless you are in a position where you are worth bargaining with. That's what is meant by negotiating from strength. And that is where the role of the U.S. Armed Forces comes in in the pursuit of a generation of peace.

The past year's activities and accomplishments with the Soviet Union and China would not have been possible or sensible if the tough-minded leaders of those nations had perceived the United States as lacking in will or as militarily weak.

Nor will our initial agreements stand up any longer than those foreign leaders continue to view our military capability with respect.

The successes thus far achieved through negotiations can be attributed, of course, to a willingness of the negotiating parties to accommodate conflicting interests.

But let there be no mistake, such willingness is directly related to the relative bargaining power of the parties concerned. And in those negotiations related to military arms, bargaining strength is synonymous with military strength.

If we expect ongoing arms-limitation and force-reduction talks to be productive, we must maintain our military strength—in combination with our allies where appropriate. We must at all costs avoid unilateral disarmament actions. We must recall that things given as gifts cannot be negotiated. And as President Nixon said last week: "What one side is willing to give up for free, the other side will not bargain for."

In this regard, Americans need to remember that our armed forces now are smaller and have less purchasing power in their budgets than at any time for a quarter century.

The reordering of our national priorities has placed defense spending below human-resource spending and at the lowest portion of the Gross National Product in 24 years. At the same time that we have achieved these purchasing-power lows, our nation has moved ahead with its desire to try an all-volunteer force of well-paid men and women. We have ended the draft. Military pay and other people costs now take up some 57 percent of the defense budget.

And, we have cut out hundreds of ships and closed or reduced hundreds of bases.

Not since Harry Truman was President and Louis Johnson was Secretary of Defense has American defense been so austere.

As you know, our President is making a determined effort to reduce federal spending and to hold the federal budget within reasonable and prudent limits. To do this, he has had to take a fresh look at some of the outworn and nonproductive programs that have grown up over the years and to place a ceiling on overall federal spending.

We in the Department of Defense have contributed to this effort by holding level the purchasing power of the defense budget so that domestic priorities can have a majority share of federal funding. But, we agree fully with the Commander-in-Chief that it would be unsafe for our people to allow further drastic cuts in the defense budget at a time when we are trying hard in many forums to negotiate with potential adversaries from a position of strength.

The point, of course, is that those who clamor to cut billions more dollars from the defense budget, yet who also want the nation to achieve further progress in negotiations, cannot have it both ways. U.S. budget priorities already have been reordered to the domestic side. Further major cuts in defense forces would cut into bone and muscle needed to backup negotiating strength—and needed to assure our nation's security and our peoples' safety if negotiations fail and aggression or international blackmail occur.

The Department of Defense does not underestimate the task before us in maintaining credible, effective forces as we move into a new world era.

We understand the difficulties deriving from Vietnam, but we intend to keep our eye not on the past, but on America's Bicentennial and third hundred years.

We know most Americans want a strong country, but we know they also demand and deserve reasons why defense is essential in time of peace—reasons why detente without defense is delusion. We believe that a national consensus on the importance of peacetime deterrent forces is obtainable.

And, we will do our part to be worthy of public confidence and respect and to vigorously respond to the need and desire of all our citizens to know about our Defense activities, programs, and plans.

Because, we cannot achieve a volunteer armed force, and we cannot meet the demands of developing detente, unless the American people know, understand, and support our national security policies and— even more important—know, understand, and support the men and women of the Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines.

It's all about strength, and it's all about peace, and it's all about liberty. Because, as Emerson once wrote:

"For what avail the plough or sail,
Or land, or life
If freedom fail."

FIRST 100 YEARS

HON. RICHARDSON PREYER

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. PREYER. Mr. Speaker, the history of this country is written in the biographies of its people and its communities. Our story as a nation is the story of farms and villages, towns and cities, and the people who live in them.

It is in the simple strength of a good life in a good community that the true splendor of our people is best reflected.

In my district this weekend a town and its people are joining together to celebrate their 100 years as a community.

Reidsville, N.C., is a community of good people living a good life. It is in such a place that our problems and our opportunities are put in their best perspective. It is among such people that we will find the best answers as to how to make this Nation realize again what it can mean to us and to the rest of the world.

Reidsville is a city of textiles and tobacco and flourishing new industries among these traditional strengths of our North Carolina economy.

It is a city located in the midst of a country that has produced six of my State's Governors.

Best of all, it is a place that will pause for only a brief reflection on the first 100 years; then strike out to make the second 100 even more successful.

NELSEN SUBSTITUTE MEANS DIVIDED GOVERNMENT—A WEAK MAYOR, WEAK COUNCIL SYSTEM

HON. CHARLES C. DIGGS, JR.

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DIGGS. Mr. Speaker, it is clear that the Nelsen substitute would mean weak, ineffective local government for Washington, D.C.

DIVIDED GOVERNMENT NOT EFFECTIVE

H.R. 10692 would establish a divided local government that is neither fully elected or fully appointed. The bill calls for an elected city council but a Presidentially appointed Commissioner, or Mayor. I fail to comprehend how this arrangement will enhance the effectiveness of local government in the District of Columbia. The Commissioner would be hand picked by the Presidential incumbent while the eight-member Council would be elected, one member from each of the eight election wards. The Commissioner and Council members would serve 4-year terms. Council members would choose a chairman and vice chairman.

INCOMPLETE CONSOLIDATION

The reorganization provisions of title I stop short of giving local government full control over the functions to be reorganized. The bill calls for transfer of NCHA to the District government as an agency but unlike H.R. 9682, the city government would have to obtain NCPC approval of all public housing projects. H.R. 10692 would authorize the Commissioner to operate a public employment service but the service would remain under the supervision of the Labor Department; H.R. 9682 would transfer the manpower agency to the city government. H.R. 10692, like H.R. 9682, would transfer RLA to the city government but would not retain RLA eligibility to participate in the small business administration procurement program.

NATIONAL CAPITAL PLANNING COMMISSION GIVEN CONTROL

Title II of H.R. 10692 on planning incorporates a bill introduced earlier by Congressman NELSEN as H.R. 9215 to amend the National Capital Planning Act of 1952. Under title II the predominant role of NCPC in the District of Columbia would be strengthened. The membership of NCPC would be reconstituted by designating different Federal agency representatives, adding the Architect of the Capitol and District of Columbia council chairman, adding one more citizen member and requiring that one of the six citizen representatives be from the

Maryland environs and one be from the Virginia environs.

NCPC is designated as the central planning agency for the Federal Government in the national capital region and as the agency to adopt a comprehensive plan for the National Capital. The bill's creation of a municipal planning office for the District of Columbia government, with the District of Columbia Commissioner and Council responsible for preparing, approving, and submitting a plan to NCPC for approval, is designed to establish the control of NCPC over all planning, including urban renewal major thoroughfare, and mass transit plans, and zoning matters in the District of Columbia.

Under title II NCPC would not be limited, as in H.R. 9682, to review of local plans with respect only to the adverse impact on the Federal interests and functions. NCPC would have 60 days to veto any plan in any respect. The city and Federal Governments would also be required to submit all preliminary and successive plans for property acquisition or lease to NCPC for a determination of conformity with the comprehensive plan.

H.R. 9682 on the other hand provides zoning with the power of judicial intervention if the District of Columbia Zoning Commission should step outside the bounds of the comprehensive plan but retains the leeway necessary for local initiative on purely local matters.

H.R. 10692, the Nelsen bill, would thus increase Federal control for making the ultimate decisions but assign only the burdens of planning development and clearance to the local government.

DIVIDED AUTHORITY FOR BUDGETING IN NELSEN BILL

Title III of H.R. 10692 would transfer to the District of Columbia Council certain taxing and fee-setting authority and licensing authority for occupations, professions, and businesses, trades, or callings heretofore regulated by act of Congress. H.R. 9682 would also provide for the transfer of such revenue raising and regulatory authority to the District government, but would do so in the general context of self-government for the District of Columbia, importantly including authority to enact appropriations for the city government.

Thus, H.R. 9682 would provide the elected city government with both expenditure and revenue-raising authority, which should reside in the same governmental unit. H.R. 10692, on the other hand, would separate authority over these two essential government functions, retaining in the Congress not just control of the Federal payment but the final authority for deciding how much money will be spent by the District and placing on the city council the responsibility for imposing taxes to finance the congressionally approved budget. Such a division of authority and responsibility would hamper effective financial management and limit the establishment of responsible government in the District of Columbia.

LICENSING

The transfer of authority to the council over licensing of professions, businesses, and occupations is identical to the "District of Columbia Licensing Proce-

dures Act" proposed by the District of Columbia government to the 93d and earlier Congresses. While this is a desirable addition to the city's authority it makes no improvement in the structure of government. It is fully compatible with the present form of government created under Reorganization Plan No. 3 of 1967 and would perpetuate the piecemeal approach to local self-determination in effect under this plan.

FEDERAL PAYMENT BUT NO AUTHORIZATION

Title IV of H.R. 10692 would not essentially change existing procedures for the authorization and appropriation by the Congress of the annual Federal Payment to the District of Columbia.

H.R. 9682 is better, however, because while preserving the ultimate authority of the Congress in the appropriation of the Federal payment, it would broaden the roles of the elected mayor and city council in recommending the amount to be appropriated. It would also provide an open-authorization for four fiscal years beginning with the fiscal year ending June 30, 1976. This authorization, which is not provided by H.R. 10692, would facilitate the annual appropriation process and would thus aid in the financial management of the District of Columbia government.

MUNICIPAL BONDS PROVISION LEFT OUT

H.R. 10692 does not include authorization for the District of Columbia to issue general obligations bonds to finance its various capital projects. This authority is included in H.R. 9682, which would thus permit the District of Columbia to finance its capital improvements program in the same way as other municipalities. Necessary safeguards for ensuring proper financial management of the bond program are contained in H.R. 9682.

NELSEN SUBSTITUTE HAS MINI-ENCLAVE

H.R. 10692 would establish a national Capital Service Area to include the Federal monuments, the White House, the Capitol Building, the Federal executive, legislative, and judicial office buildings adjacent to the Mall and Capitol Building. The office of the NCSA would be located in the Office of the President who would appoint the director of NCSA at a level IV executive schedule salary level. The NCSA would be responsible for providing adequate police and fire protection, maintenance of streets and highways, and sanitation services for the service area. Within 1 year the President is to report to Congress on the feasibility of combining the Federal Executive Protective Service, U.S. Park Police, and the U.S. Capitol Police in the Office of the NCSA.

I hope this analysis will assist in evaluating the Nelsen substitute which has been offered as an alternative to the committee bill. Clearly it is not a real alternative.

The Nelsen substitute fails to eliminate the present fragmentation in local government in the District. The committee bill on the other hand gives locally elected officials the authority and the tools and the streamlined structure necessary to meet the challenge of local government in a large urban area.

MURDER BY HANDGUN: THE CASE FOR GUN CONTROL—NO. 29

HON. MICHAEL HARRINGTON

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. HARRINGTON. Mr. Speaker, anyone who thinks that MacArthur Walls is grateful for our country's lenient gun control laws probably does not know that he was shot to death last month.

I have heard the argument:

If our gun laws were more relaxed, he could have had his own gun to protect himself with.

And then, there might have been two deaths instead of one. These advocates claim that stringent gun laws would not save any lives and would mainly infringe on our constitutional rights. The yearly tallies of handgun deaths easily refute the first point, and an editorial on station WBZ severely questions the factuality of the second point.

The second amendment, when carefully read, only refers to the State militia's rights to bear arms—without Federal interference—not the individual's prerogative. When the Constitution was written, owning a gun was as common as owning a radio is today; there was no need to legislate on it. But today, a handgun is a menace to society. Our only protection is gun control—now.

The WBZ editorial and the Washington Post article follow:

SUSPECT CHARGED IN NORTHEAST DEATH

Metropolitan police arrested a man early yesterday in the shooting death of MacArthur Walls, 24, of 1633 28th St. SE, whose body was found Saturday night in the Rosedale playground in Northeast.

Freddie Meck Davis Jr., 27, of 1638 F St. NE, was arrested by homicide detectives at his home about 2:30 a.m. and charged with murder, police said.

Walls was discovered suffering from multiple gunshot wounds in a corner of the playground at 17th and I Streets NE by a nearby resident about midnight Saturday, police said. He was pronounced dead on the scene.

ANOTHER ROUND ON GUN CONTROL, No. 4

(By Lamont L. Thompson)

There's one thing about doing an editorial series urging tight gun controls. You don't lack for mail and phone calls. Over the past two years we've had more comment and criticism on this issue than on almost any other series we've done. We've talked to callers and answered the mail when people will give us an address to write to.

But we'd like to respond publicly to one point that keeps popping up. Many people feel that firearms controls and restrictions are unconstitutional because of the second amendment, part of our Bill of Rights. That does say in part that the right of the people to keep and bear arms shall not be infringed. But that's only the second half of the sentence. The first part of the amendment ties that right to the operation of a state militia.

The Courts have consistently interpreted the second amendment as a prohibition against interference with the state militia, not a guarantee of the individual's right to bear arms. So the federal government can regulate firearms as long as it doesn't interfere with state military personnel in performing official duties. States can also control firearms as long as they don't interfere

with the exercise of federal powers such as the equipment of the army.

Massachusetts has enacted a fairly comprehensive system of firearms controls, which are perfectly legal. If our laws and regulations were in fact made a national standard and then really enforced, we'd be a long way down the road to a sensible firearms policy. And there would be no conflict with the constitution and its guarantees.

SISTERS OF CHARITY HOSPITAL IN BUFFALO: AGE, 125

HON. THADDEUS J. DULSKI

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DULSKI. Mr. Speaker, since 1848—a span of 125 years—the city of Buffalo, N.Y., has benefited from the devoted care of members of the Sisters of Charity.

It was in that year that three nuns, Sisters Ursula Mattingly, Hyeronimo, and Ann Sebastian, arrived in the city from the Emmitsburg, Md., mother house to open a hospital. Buffalo then had no hospital, despite valiant efforts by leading citizens.

Most Reverend John Timon, CM, who was named Buffalo's first Roman Catholic bishop the previous year, had prevailed upon the Sisters of Charity to open not only a hospital, but also an orphanage.

The record of achievement over the past 125 years is enviable, highlighted by one "first" after another. The only hospital to serve as teaching hospital for two medical schools; residency students since 1849 and resident graduates since 1889; pioneer in modern-day departmentalized operation; first Grey Ladies; first intensive care unit; first methadone clinic; first medical director; to mention a few.

Mr. Speaker, I have had the honor of being very close to the activities of Sisters of Charity Hospital for many years. Its contributions to our community welfare are beyond measure. For the Sisters it is a mission in life. For the people of the Buffalo area, present and preceding generations, it is and has been a vital stimulant to the lifeblood of our people.

I extend my sincere anniversary congratulations to Sisters Hospital, its president, Sister Mary Charles, its management, and its staff.

The trials and tribulations of the Sisters of Charity, particularly in their early days in Buffalo, have been recited in most sympathetic and dramatic fashion by Mildred Spencer, retired nationally recognized medical writer. I include her two articles with my remarks:

[From Buffalo Evening News, Sept. 29, 1973]
THE SISTERS OF CHARITY: FOR 125 YEARS THEY HAVE BEEN BUFFALO'S "SISTER SERVANTS"

(By Mildred Spencer)

Their names were Sisters Ursula Mattingly, Hyeronimo and Ann Sebastian, and they had come to Buffalo, in their black widows' caps and long black dresses, to open a hospital.

As they stepped from the train at the Exchange St. Station on June 3, 1848, they saw a bustling city, a major shipping point for manufactured goods moving west and the products of farm and forest moving east.

North St. was the city line. Beyond that stretched an area of farming land referred to as "Buffalo Plains." The streets were unpaved and several were maintained by private owners and had toll gates. There were no sewers.

The city had a population of 30,000, one-fifth of whom were foreign born. Many were desperately poor, but they worked hard and managed to get along unless stricken by serious illness. Then, all too often, the only answer was the Erie County Almshouse on Porter Ave.

There the well, the sick, the mentally retarded, "lunatics," and newborn babies were crowded together in small wards.

Dr. Austin Flint, who had come to Buffalo in 1836, had been trying, for more than ten years, to convince the citizens of Erie County of the need for "new and more efficient means of medical relief" for the sick poor.

In 1846 there had been an attempt by a group of community leaders to set up such a hospital, but it had failed, partly because of lack of money.

BISHOP TIMON TAKES ACTION

Lack of money didn't deter the Rt. Rev. John Timon, CM, when Pope Gregory XVI named him first bishop of Western New York in 1847. Bishop Timon listened to Dr. Flint—and to his personal physician, Dr. James Plat White—and decided to do something about the situation.

In his need, Bishop Timon turned to the sister order of his own priestly order of Vincentians—the Daughters of Charity of St. Vincent de Paul—the Sisters of Charity.

In March, 1848, he visited their mother house in Emmitsburg, Md. He returned to Buffalo with the promise of two communities of sisters, one to open a hospital, the other an orphanage.

When the three sisters arrived June 3, with three others to start an orphanage, there was housing for the orphanage group but none for Sisters Ursula, Hyeronimo and Ann Sebastian. Nor was there any hospital building.

The Rev. Francis Guth, pastor of St. Louis Church, gave up his own house to the sisters and went to live with a family in the parish.

Within three weeks the hospital problem was solved. On June 21 Bishop Timon bought from the Buffalo Orphan Asylum its 3½-story brick building near the new building then being constructed for the two-year-old University of Buffalo Medical School at Main and Virginia Sts.

But the Buffalo Orphan Asylum, unsuccessful in finding another, more suitable building for its own needs, failed to vacate the property. On July 5, an impatient Bishop Timon went to the director.

CARING FOR ORPHANS

He made a suggestion. If the orphanage would move out, he said, the sisters would care for the girl orphans in their cottage and he would take the boy orphans into his own home until a new building was found.

The move began the next day and was completed on July 8. The sisters immediately began putting the brick building in shape for a hospital. It sadly wanted repairs, the first general report, published Nov. 27, 1850, noted.

Sister Ursula had been designated the administrator of the hospital and the sister superior of the little group. She called herself, however, the "sister servant."

The services of the sisters were freely given, but patients had to have food and medicine and there was laundry and some heavy cleaning that the sisters could not do.

To meet these additional expenses, the sisters set up a fee schedule for those who could afford to pay.

They charged \$1.50 a week for persons referred by other charitable agencies (usually paid by the agency); \$2.50 for ward patients who could afford to pay; and \$4

for patients in private who had their own physicians.

There was a special rate for county charges. Concerned about the deplorable conditions at the Almshouse, the sisters offered to take patients from there for just what the county was spending on their care—60 cents a week.

Thirty-three of Buffalo's estimated 80 physicians, only half of whom were "regular" medical doctors, applied for appointment to the staff of the new hospital. They agreed to care for all ward patients without fees.

PHYSICIANS FLOCK TO AID

The first medical board consisted of three founders of the UB Medical School—Dr. Flint, Dr. Frank Hastings Hamilton and Dr. White—and Dr. Josiah Trowbridge, a past president of the Erie County Medical Society and past mayor of Buffalo.

Because Bishop Timon appreciated the importance of bedside teaching in the preparation of young doctors, the Sisters of Charity Hospital was a teaching hospital from the beginning.

An arrangement was made by which students attending the medical school would be admitted "under proper regulations" to the wards of the hospital for clinical instruction by Drs. Flint and Hamilton.

The hospital formally opened Oct. 1, 1848, but the first patients had been admitted in August. One of these was a 20-year-old "mariner," taken ill on board his vessel and transported to the hospital when the boat docked in Buffalo Aug. 23. His treatment for typhus was described by Dr. Flint in the first of many reports of hospital patients published in the Buffalo Medical Journal, which he edited.

Typhus, transmitted by lice and fleas, was common in those days, as was typhoid fever and tuberculosis more commonly called consumption. And, in 1849, the year after the hospital opened, there was cholera.

With death carts rumbling through the streets, the sisters offered the City Council the use of the hospital for cholera patients. Of the 134 they cared for, 82 survived—as compared with 115 of the 243 treated in the cholera hospital subsequently established by the city.

"The results of the Charity Hospital as declared by the rate of mortality certainly affords grounds for much satisfaction," Dr. Flint wrote in the Buffalo Medical Journal. He praised the sisters' "scrupulous exactness in the execution of all medical directions and fidelity in the administration of remedies."

NONDENOMINATIONAL AT OUTSET

Bishop Timon had decided, in the beginning, that the hospital, although founded and maintained by the Catholic Church would admit patients without question of creed. If a non-Catholic patient wished "spiritual help from his own religion," his own clergyman would be invited to attend him. There was to be no effort to convert patients to Catholicism.

Older children whose parents died in the hospital were sent to one of two orphanages established by the church in 1849—St. Vincent's Female Orphan Asylum, operated by the second group of sisters who came in 1848, and St. Joseph's Boys' Orphan Asylum.

Neither orphanage was equipped to care for children under six. Orphaned babies, and those born out of wedlock whose mothers did not take them, were housed in a wing of the hospital. As their numbers grew, the sisters were forced to spend more and more time caring for them and this limited their attendance on the sick.

Again Bishop Timon turned to the mother house of the Sisters of Charity at Emmitsburg. More sisters were sent north. Three cottages from the hospital site were moved to land on Edward St. which had been donated to the church by the heirs of Louis

S. LeCourteix, who had earlier given the land for the Buffalo Orphan Asylum.

Fifteen babies were moved there to live until a new brick building could be constructed. Funds for the building were raised by public subscription and grants from the state, county and city.

READY FOR EPIDEMIC

When another epidemic of cholera struck in 1854, the new building was ready. Bishop Timon himself carried some of the newly-orphaned babies from the hospital to their new home, St. Mary's Infant Asylum and Maternity Hospital.

The "sister servant" of St. Mary's was Sister Rosaline Brown, one of the new group of sisters to come from Emmitsburg.

With other sisters she canvassed the city and surrounding villages to get funds and provisions for her charges. Often the sisters picked fruit and vegetables, even dug potatoes.

On one such foraging expedition Sister Rosaline stopped at the Almshouse. Although the Sisters of Charity Hospital had relieved the county institution of the care of the acutely ill, there was still no suitable place for the mentally ill.

She went to Bishop Timon who advanced \$6630 with which the sisters bought the farm of Dr. Flint (who had left Buffalo) at Main St. and Kensington Ave. in the Buffalo Plains. There they erected a brick building which was completed in 1860. Initially named the Providence Lunatic Asylum it subsequently became Providence Retreat.

In the beginning, Providence Retreat took in only the mentally ill, charging \$2.50 a week for room, food and medical care. Later it admitted alcoholics and drug addicts as well.

Meanwhile the original hospital, which had added still another wing, was rapidly outgrowing its old building, whose capacity had grown from 100 to 200 in the first 25 years.

In 1876 it moved to a new building at Delavan Ave. and Main St. which had a capacity of 334.

ESTABLISH TWO OTHER HOSPITALS

Subsequently the sisters established the Good Samaritan Dispensary and Eye and Ear Infirmary (1882) and Emergency Hospital (1884), the city's first hospital for accident and emergency patients in an area becoming highly industrialized.

Eventually the special functions of all of the separate institutions were to be combined in an enlarged and modernized Sisters Hospital on the site of what had been Providence Retreat.

The Retreat was closed in 1940, and the maternity division of the hospital at Main and Delavan, with that of St. Mary's on Edward St., moved there. The new unit was named the Louise de Marillac Hospital.

The buildings at Main and Delavan were closed in 1956 and the other divisions of the hospital followed maternity to the Main and Kensington site. Emergency Hospital was taken over by the Diocese four years later.

The old Providence Retreat was torn down and new buildings were erected.

NOW, STAFF OF 1,300

The new hospital is a far cry, physically and scientifically, from the first one on St. Louis Place. The patients who occupy its 444 beds and 72 bassinets get the latest and best of medical and surgical care from a medical staff of 350. Much of the work once done by the sisters is now carried out by more than 1300 full-time employees.

The Sisters, however, are still the spirit of the hospital. There are 14 of them—eight in administrative and professional posts and six who work on part-time assignments, visiting the patients, and making them comfortable.

The sturdy brick buildings that housed the hospital during its early years still stand at St. Louis Pl. and Virginia St. and are now marked by a plaque.

CXIX—2086—Part 25

There is no record of what happened to Sister Ursula after 1863 when she was succeeded as "sister servant" by Sister Ann Louise. Sister Hyeronimo went to Rochester in 1857 to start St. Mary's Hospital there. Sister Ann Sebastian spent 17 years in Buffalo. At the time of the hospital's 50th anniversary in 1898, Sister Ann Sebastian was the only one of the three still living. From Mt. Hope Retreat, Baltimore, she wrote:

"I look back with pleasure to my dear Buffalo Mission, where we had such a hard beginning and labored so hard. Thanks to our dear Lord, who has blessed our labors, I look with pleasure on the 17 years that I spent in Buffalo Mission; it is a dear mission to me, and I pray daily for its continuance."

AN HONORED TRADITION OF BEING FIRST

Sisters of Charity Hospital is the only hospital in Buffalo to have served as the primary teaching hospital for two medical schools.

From 1848 to 1858, when Buffalo General Hospital was opened, it was the only teaching hospital for the University of Buffalo. After that the two hospitals shared teaching responsibilities.

The Buffalo Medical Journal commented in 1858 that the availability of teaching facilities at Sisters Hospital during its early years "placed the University of Buffalo on a par with the colleges of larger cities" and gave it "a position it never could have attained without the advantage of bedside instruction."

When Niagara University established a medical school in Buffalo in 1883, Sisters became its teaching hospital, and continued to be until the school merged with UB in 1893.

The hospital had a resident medical student, or "extern" in today's terms, as early as 1849. In 1852 such a program was made official.

In 1855 the hospital set up a program of "residency" for graduates of the Medical School and in 1889 a school of nursing. Even earlier the case histories of patients treated there, published in the Buffalo Journal, were contributing to the postgraduate education of practicing physicians throughout the United States, Ohio, Pennsylvania and in nearby Canada.

Before the turn of the century, the forward-looking Sisters of Charity and their medical staff recognized that medicine was changing. In 1898 they reorganized the staff and established hospital departments as they exist today, under the direction of trained specialists.

SAW NEEDS AND MET THEM

They saw the community's needs and met them, one after another—first the hospital itself; then the infant asylum and maternity hospital, with a special ward for unwed mothers; then an institution to treat the mentally ill, alcoholics and drug addicts; then a hospital for accident and injury cases.

In all of these they were first in Buffalo and they have continued to make history up to the present day.

The Marillac Guild, organized in 1935 to "solace and comfort" patients, prevailed upon the Red Cross to train some of its members as Buffalo's first Grey Ladies.

Sisters Hospital had the first modern intensive care unit in the city and the first electronically monitored coronary heart unit. The Buffalo Fire Department's rescue squads transmit electrocardiograms taken throughout the city to the heart unit by radio for rapid diagnosis.

The hospital sponsored the first methadone clinic in Buffalo.

It was the first hospital to utilize closed circuit television for the regular education of patients and staff—and for "visiting" by patients with children too young to be allowed in their rooms.

Sisters was the first hospital to employ a corporate group of experienced, fully-licensed

physicians to staff its emergency room and one of the first two in the city to have a full-time director of medical education, named in 1961.

The hospital will be the first in the area to have its own medical office building, scheduled to open in 1974. And its extended care facility, now under construction, will be one of the first in Erie County to be erected as part of a hospital.

REMOVAL OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

HON. EDWARD J. DERWINSKI

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry is one of the largest and most active groups of its kind.

Its governmental affairs division is headed by Preston E. Peden, who once served in this body as a Representative from Oklahoma.

At a recent meeting of the Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry, a policy statement was adopted calling for immediate removal of wage and price controls. I am in fundamental agreement with the points made in this statement.

I insert the full statement in the RECORD, trusting that it will not only be studied by my colleagues, but that officials in the executive branch of Government, and even the President himself, will look at this very timely and forthright statement.

CHICAGO ASSOCIATION OF COMMERCE AND INDUSTRY RECOMMENDS THE REMOVAL OF WAGE AND PRICE CONTROLS

The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry urges the immediate removal of wage and price controls.

The Association is concerned and disturbed with the drift of current U.S. economic policy. The controls have not stabilized wages and prices or checked inflation. Instead, they have contributed to shortages, black markets, misallocations, production cut-backs and waste of resources. The controls obscure the transmission of price and demand signals to producers. They upset business confidence and business planning. They encourage quality deterioration and the elimination of low priced and low profit items. They discourage capital spending needed for increased output of scarce commodities. Controls have increased government's role in business decision making.

At best the controls prolong the period of price adjustments but do not avoid eventual price increases. They divert attention of policy makers from monetary and fiscal management which would work if tried. Beyond the short run, or unaccompanied by patriotic fervor, price or wage controls have never succeeded in history. The experience of Office of Price Stabilization is a recent reminder of their failure to control prices during the Korean War.

Price controls have created unsettled conditions in the meat industry with record stocks being withheld or diverted from their natural domestic market, processing plants being shut down and great uncertainty developing regarding future beef supply. Other commodity shortages have also developed.

The Association is fully aware that 1973

price increases stemmed from many causes. World wide shortages and an increasing world population intensified the demand for food. Devaluation of the dollar promoted the export of scarce food and feed commodities. Adverse crop weather reduced harvests, food supplies and grain surpluses at home and abroad. Environmental controls of diverse governmental units have artificially reduced the supply of available fuels throughout the country. The resultant demand for unrestricted fuels has elevated their prices and created severe shortages. Price increases suppressed by Phase II caught up during Phase III. There were some price hikes anticipatory of another freeze. As the economy approached full employment, production labor costs rose and pushed against prices.

The Association is cognizant of appropriate and laudatory, if tardy, measures to encourage full production of scarce commodities. Increased production will retard price increases and promote price decreases. Administration efforts to increase farm production and release commodity stockpiles are commendable. The Presidential instruction to the Secretary of the Interior to triple continental shelf land available for oil exploration clearly intends to ameliorate shortages of these products. Much tighter fiscal control of federal deficits as an anti-inflationary measure deserves our loud applause. Measures of Federal monetary agencies to restrain credit expansion are the logical consequence of an expansionary monetary policy pursued for many years. Nevertheless they are appropriate at this moment in the development of the economy. These measures tightened monetary and fiscal policies and a curb upon credit expansion will control inflation even with controls removed.

The Association recognizes that immediate termination of wage and price controls, which it recommends, could result in some short run price increases. It feels that American consumers will be better served by bearing short term price increases in exchange for long term price stability and plentiful supplies. Without controls volatile food prices will stabilize and even come down with two good harvests and expanded food production.

The United States has passed through a decade of failure to discipline money management, federal spending and the regulation of farm and petroleum production. Both the legislative and executive branches of the U.S. Government and the U.S. monetary authorities have ignored the warnings of economists, analysts and business leaders to effect these disciplines. Controls are the culmination of this neglect.

Price and wage controls have created shortages which will worsen as long as they remain. They could lead to more extensive control. They impede a return to price stability. They have increased business' burdens and costs. They have reduced production and inspired waste of resources. They have diminished the voluntary and uncoerced exchange of labor, goods and capital. They have suppressed investment and production planning for higher quality and lower cost goods. They have fostered a climate of immorality and uncertainty characterized by evasion of regulations, destruction of commodities, and excessive job hopping.

The Chicago Association of Commerce and Industry reaffirms its faith in a market oriented economy with price flexibility which is currently threatened by government decree. If there was temporary support from business for the freeze two years ago, the Association feels at this time that there is a strong consensus of business opinion in opposition to the controls. It urges the immediate cessation of the controls.

DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA OPTOMETRIC CENTER COMMENDED FOR EFFORTS AT VISION CARE

HON. WALTER E. FAUNTROY

OF THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. FAUNTROY. Mr. Speaker, as the representative from the District of Columbia, it is my privilege to commend the successful efforts of the Optometric Center of the National Capital.

During this last year, more than 60 doctors of optometry freely served at the clinic operated by the center in downtown Washington. Some 400 persons were given care and glasses if needed. For the last several years, District of Columbia schools have sent their students for vision care to the center through a contractual arrangement with the Department of Human Resources. Last year, the center sponsored and conducted vision screening projects, utilizing volunteer optometrists and their spouses at various schools in the area.

Participating optometrists are members of the Optometric Council of the National Capital Region, which includes the District of Columbia, central Maryland and northern Virginia. In addition to the optometric members supporting this service, New Eyes for the Needy, a public service organization, and the Washington Society for the Blind have given valuable financial assistance.

The president of the center, Dr. Barry Ephriam, has expressed special interest concerning proper vision care. This involves the need for people to receive professional vision care for correction of vision problems and as a preventive measure against blindness. The center gives the following guides so patients may know what they have a right to expect from the practitioner in vision care:

EYE CARE GUIDES

1. Take a health history to ascertain whether one has any kind of ailments, allergies or diseases, or are taking drugs that may affect one's vision;
2. Inspect the eyes and lids carefully for any signs of lesions or irritations in or near the eye;
3. Examine the interior of the eye for conditions such as diabetes and cataract;
4. Test ocular reflexes, eye movements and side vision;
5. Check the hardness of the eye as a test for glaucoma;
6. Use a series of visual tests to check visual acuity, astigmatism, eye coordination and muscle function;
7. Ask questions about visual habits on the job, while driving and while enjoying hobbies;
8. Fully inform one of the nature of his visual problem, if any, and what needs to be done to improve the visual performance;
9. If glasses are needed, he will assist in the selection of frames to determine the exact position at which the frame will hold the lenses before the eyes, the proper fit, appropriateness of the frame in your line of work, and the appearance of the frame in relation to facial features;
10. Follow up to see how well the eyes have adapted to the glasses; and

11. If care is needed beyond what he is able to provide, he will refer one to the proper specialist for care.

Another service provided by the center is with its lost and found telephone number. Persons either losing glasses or finding glasses—including contact lenses—may utilize this service. The number in the District of Columbia is 347-1622.

The continued operation and expansion of services of the Optometric Center is important to this community. I compliment its members for this public service and encourage their continued success.

CENTENNIAL ANNIVERSARY FOR HOOSAC TUNNEL IN MASSACHUSETTS

HON. SILVIO O. CONTE

OF MASSACHUSETTS
IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. CONTE. Mr. Speaker, this year marks the 100th anniversary of the completion of the Hoosac Tunnel in North Adams, Mass.

It is particularly fitting that we pause to reflect on the history of this rail passageway at this time. For today, Mr. Speaker, our northeast railroads are in desperate trouble.

At the time this tunnel was planned and construction began in the mid-1880's, that, of course, was not the case.

You all know the familiar line about an irresistible force meeting an immovable object. In the mid-1880's our railroads were undeniably an "irresistible force" in this country. They provided the only viable means of cross-country transit. In western Massachusetts this "irresistible force" met its "immovable" match in the form of the Hoosac Mountain.

My First Congressional District is well known for its beautiful rolling hills. While they make for great beauty, they do not make for great railroading. But, travel through these hills provided a direct route from Boston to the west. In order to conquer the obstacle provided by the Hoosac Mountain, work started in 1851 on the construction of a tunnel through it.

More than 800 men labored to build the tunnel. The work was agonizingly slow. Two men, one serving merely to hold a chisel, could struggle for hours putting only a dent in the surface of the rock.

I know it was back-breaking work. It was the work my father told me about when I was young, for he was a member of the force that carried on the work of that original crew. If I may be allowed one further personal note, it was through his work at the tunnel that my father met my mother, whose mother, Angela Lora, ran a boarding house, providing a warm home for the men who worked long hours in the tunnel shaft.

It took 24 years to complete the initial tunneling. It cost \$15 million and ex-

acted an even dearer cost in lives lost in the process of construction, a total of 195.

However, the tunnel stands as a "classic" of American know-how and that famed "Yankee ingenuity."

The tunnel served as a practical "proving ground" for new techniques in excavation. A narrative history of the tunnel, prepared by the Hoosac Tunnel Centennial Committee reports that operation of a drill used in the tunnel, the Burleigh drill, "depended upon construction of air compressor machines." Thus, the report concludes, "the American compressed air industry which was to lead the world in mine construction tools grew out of the Hoosac Tunnel project."

The tunnel process also saw the first practical use of tri-nitroglycerine. The chemical, approximately 1 million pounds of it, was manufactured right at the site. It was discovered, through the project, that the substance will not explode in its solid, frozen, state.

Another "first," the use of blasting caps to detonate the explosive charges, was also recorded at the tunnel.

The project was one characterized by numerous delays, in fact, the eminent Oliver Wendell Holmes was doubtful it would ever see completion. He expressed these doubts in a poem entitled, "The Great Bore":

"When publishers no longer steal,
And pay for what they stole before,
When the first locomotive's wheel,
Rolls through the Hoosac Tunnel's bore;
Till then let Cummings blaze away,
And Miller's saints blow up the globe;
But when you see that blessed day,
Then order your ascension robe!"

But the doomsayers were proved wrong and the tunnel was completed, the headings joined, in late 1873.

The first train passed through the tunnel in 1875 and that same year, the first passenger train used the tunnel.

The last passenger train used the tunnel in 1958 when the regular scheduled passenger service was terminated.

This weekend, an excursion trip has been planned through the tunnel by the Hoosac Tunnel Centennial Committee. I understand that it is a "sold out" event and that eight cars will be making the trip. The cars going through the tunnel on their way from Boston to North Adams will be carrying railroad buffs, historians, descendants of the men who risked and gave their lives in the construction of the tunnel, and just plain adventuresome citizens. Undoubtedly on this sentimental journey, they will reflect on the good old days of railroading. We cannot, of course, bring those days back. But we can work to keep our Northeast railroads strong.

Today, Mr. Speaker, I salute all of those who have planned and are taking part in this 100th anniversary celebration, and I salute those men and women who, long ago, worked to build the Hoosac Tunnel. They have given me, and I hope they will give you, inspiration for the task ahead of us. That task is to bend every effort to see that our Northeast railroads continue to be a strong seg-

ment of this country's transportation system.

HEADSTART—SUCCESS OR FAILURE

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, October 4, 1973

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, in May of this year, Dr. Edward Zigler, former Director of the Office of Child Development within the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and presently director of the child development program at Yale University, published an article assessing the Headstart program in the journal, *Learning*.

Because Dr. Zigler was one of the men who helped to plan Headstart, and was, indeed, in charge of the program for 2 years, and because of his extraordinary devotion to the cause of quality child care services, I urge my colleagues to study his assessment with the greatest care.

For the central point of Dr. Zigler's article can be accurately applied to many of the other human services programs which we are currently, and painfully, trying to evaluate.

The theme is that if we are to evaluate the success of programs such as Headstart, we must, if we are to be intellectually honest, evaluate these programs in terms of their success in attaining their actual objectives—and not the objectives arbitrarily assigned to them by others.

Says Dr. Zigler:

It is my belief that a realistic and proper assessment of Head Start demonstrates that it has been a success. Furthermore, I believe that what we have learned from Head Start to date can give clear direction to future compensatory efforts.

Because I believe Dr. Zigler's perceptive comments deserve wide consideration, Mr. Speaker, I include this article at this point in the RECORD:

PROJECT HEADSTART: SUCCESS OR FAILURE?

(By Edward Zigler)

(The depth, breadth and consequence of poverty in America have seeped deeply into the public consciousness, and conscience, in the last decade. In the midst of the shock and rhetoric surrounding that process, educators came to some conclusions of particular significance and poignancy to them. Among them was the conviction that on the day they first walk through kindergarten doors, children from poverty families are already far and perhaps hopelessly behind youngsters from better-off families. Poor nutrition, limited learning opportunities at home, little or no understanding of what the public school system will expect and demand of them—all these and more have taken too great a toll on such five-year-olds.

It was this dawning recognition that brought Head Start into being on June 30, 1965, at the heyday of the New Frontier. Since then, the federal government has spent approximately \$2.5 billion in an effort to give 4.5 million children from poor families a better chance at the education starting line. Exact statistics are hard to get, but perhaps

one child in every ten now in U.S. elementary schools is a Head Start graduate.

The social experiments of the New Frontier are under severe attack in Washington today, but Nixon budget reductions do not seem likely to reach Head Start. The administration has proposed \$407.4 million for Head Start in fiscal 1974, a \$28.2 million increase over expenditures the year before. The number of children to be covered by the program stands at 379,000.

In the article that follows, the man who helped plan Head Start and ran it for two of its most turbulent years takes a look back over that experience, and another look at what might lie ahead. He is Dr. Edward Zigler, former director of the Office of Child Development and chief of the Children's Bureau of HEW and now professor and director of the Child Development Program in the psychology department at Yale and head of the psychology section of the Yale Child Study Center.

His conclusion is that if unrealistic expectations are stripped from the Head Start record, it is an extremely worthwhile program.

Many of *Learning's* readers have taught and will continue to teach Head Start children. We invite them to read Dr. Zigler's report and, from their vantage points on the firing line, to let us hear their own judgments.)

THE GOAL OF HEAD START: SOCIAL COMPETENCE

Whether Head Start is seen as a success or a failure is determined by the factors one chooses to weigh in making such an assessment. Thus, if Head Start is appraised in terms of its success in universally raising the IQs of poor children, and maintaining these IQs over time, it is easy to write off Head Start as an abject failure. On the other hand, if one assesses Head Start in terms of the improved health of the tens of thousands of poor children who have been screened, diagnosed and treated, Head Start is clearly a resounding success.

The problem appears to be that, as a nation, we are not clear as to either the exact nature of the Head Start program or its goals. It is my belief that a realistic and proper assessment of Head Start demonstrates that it has been a success. Furthermore, I believe that what we have learned from Head Start to date can give clear direction to future compensatory efforts.

A basic requirement of any social program should be that its goals be explicitly stated and widely recognized throughout the life of the program. This has not been the case with Head Start, and its image has suffered as a result. While those who conceptualized the program already know this, it may come as a surprise to others that this preschool program was not mounted in hopes of dramatically raising IQ scores, nor of guaranteeing that all Head Start graduates would be reading at their age level at grade five.

Rather, the creators of Head Start hoped to bring about greater social competence in disadvantaged children. By social competence, we meant an individual's everyday effectiveness in dealing with his environment. A child's social competence may be described as his ability to master appropriate formal concepts, to perform well in school, to stay out of trouble with the law and to relate well to adults and other children.

We have sought to achieve this broad goal by working with the child directly, with his family and with the community in which he lives. The Head Start approach to helping children directly involves services to improve his health, intellectual ability, and social-emotional development, all of which are components of social competence.

HEALTH

With respect to health, it is recognized that social competence is fundamentally de-

pendent upon a child's physical well-being. A child who is ill or hungry cannot learn from or enjoy his experiences and relationships with those around him.

More than one third of Head Start children have been found to suffer from illnesses or physical handicaps. Of these children, 75 percent have been treated. While we can be satisfied only with 100 percent effectiveness, there can be no question that the health of the nation's poor children has been bettered by Head Start, and to the extent that they are healthy, their opportunities for cognitive and emotional growth are enhanced.

INTELLECTUAL ABILITY

With respect to formal cognitive abilities, most Head Start programs have mounted efforts directed toward improving the children's linguistic, numerical, spatial, abstraction and memory functions. Many studies have indicated that at the end of the Head Start experience and prior to entering school, Head Start children have higher scores than comparable non-Head Start children on specific measures of these abilities and on IQ tests. Head Start has also been directed toward developing those achievements, commonly labeled "intellectual," which are more often influenced by a child's particular experiences than by the quality of his formal cognitive functioning. (Thus, the child who cannot define the word "gown" may have a perfectly adequate cognitive storage and retrieval system, but simply has never heard the word.)

While experts may argue over the degree to which a compensatory education program can increase the child's span of memory, there is no question that particular experiences highly influence the specific bits of information stored in the child's memory bank. The failure to draw a distinction between a cognitive process (memory) and the products of that process (the ability to know what particular words mean) has frequently led to a simplistic assessment of compensatory education programs as well as a total misreading of what actually hinders the economically disadvantaged child in his school achievement.

This point can perhaps best be clarified by examining the performance with respect to a particular achievement of children residing in San Francisco and New York. Many more five-year-olds in San Francisco than in New York would know what a cable car was, not because they were cognitively superior to New York children but because they have much greater contact with cable cars.

Unfortunately, when economically disadvantaged children cannot produce achievements of this sort, we are all too ready to conclude that they are less bright or that their cognitive systems are less adequate, rather than attributing differences in performance to differences in experience. This error, which invariably leads to an under-assessment of the cognitive abilities of poor children, is compounded when the school fails to credit them with those achievements in which they outdistance children from more affluent homes. In school, we rarely give the child from the ghetto any credit (nor do we fault the non-ghetto child) when we discover that the ghetto child knows that "threads" means clothes and the non-ghetto child does not. Nevertheless, so long as our schools, whose values reflect those of society at large, prefer certain school achievements over others, helping poor children succeed in school and in life must involve providing them early in their lives with those experiences that make these expected achievements possible.

Head Start does exactly this. Head Start children are repeatedly found to do better

on preschool achievement tests, such as the Caldwell Preschool Inventory, than do poor children who have not had the Head Start experience.

SOCIAL AND EMOTIONAL DEVELOPMENT

The other aspects of the child that Head Start seeks to influence are those social, motivational and emotional attributes that are known to enhance a child's general social competence. These less appreciated factors include an adequate aspiration level, a healthy self-image, expectancy of success, mastery motivation, curiosity and independence.

In the few studies of Head Start in which an effort was made to assess the impact of the program on socioemotional variables, Head Start children have usually been found to be superior to non-Head Start children at the end of the Head Start year. These attributes are almost totally shaped by the environment and are probably much more plastic than the child's formal cognitive development. Certainly they are extremely decisive in determining how a child will function both in school and later in life. It is the rare person who does not possess the cognitive wherewithal to learn to read, to master the general subject matter of our schools and eventually to learn occupational skills that will allow him to contribute to society and reap its rewards.

This nation can live comfortably with the variations that we find in cognitive ability, independent of race and social class, if we will only realize that all children—with the possible exception of the severely retarded—have the cognitive potential to play productive roles in society. Why then, one might ask, are we confronted with so many young people who do not meet society's minimal expectations—school dropouts, juvenile delinquents and those who have opted for the drug culture?

The answer, I submit, is not that the cognitive ability needed to function adequately in this society is widely lacking. Rather, the failure to function adequately can usually be directly traced to a negative self-image, to a "can't do" philosophy and to a wariness and/or hostility that in all too many cases has been honestly come by. This is why our early-childhood intervention programs must be just as concerned with the social, motivational and emotional factors in development as they are with cognitive development. Ten more points of IQ make little difference with respect to the malaise that afflicts so many of our young people.

Even if we limit our discussion to lack of achievement in school, we can immediately see why affective development is such an important part of any early-childhood intervention program. It is interesting that when children from affluent homes fail in school, they are usually labeled "underachievers." Implicit in that phrase is a recognition that the children's school achievements result from some combination of cognitive factors, which determine the upper limit of performance, and motivational-emotional factors, which influence the match between actual performance and potential.

On the other hand, when we assess the performance of the economically disadvantaged child, we are all too ready to attribute his failures solely to poor cognitive ability. It should be noted that for all children only half of the variance on school achievement tests can be attributed to difference in IQs. The other 50 percent variation offers the ideal ground for intervention efforts, provided such efforts are explicitly directed toward influencing those motivational factors that have so much to do with both school and later life achievements.

FAMILY AND COMMUNITY INVOLVEMENT

As noted earlier, Head Start's efforts go far beyond those directed at the child in the center. Central to the Head Start philosophy is the view that child development is a continuous process influenced by every event experienced by the child. Intervention efforts that ignore the parents or the child's home life will certainly have limited impact. Thus parental involvement has been a cornerstone of the Head Start program from its inception.

From the outset a goal was to provide families with both information and services to help them improve their economic status and provide a better developmental environment for their children. The escape from poverty for many American families can be directly traced to the outreach and training efforts of the Head Start program and direct involvement of parents in policy-making roles.

A child's development is also influenced by the quality of the social institutions in his community. The 1970 Kirschner Report on the community impact of Head Start has made it abundantly clear that, throughout the nation, Head Start has served as a catalyst for communities to improve their educational, health and social services to the poor.

OUR GOALS BECOME DISTORTED

Since it can be easily demonstrated that the social competence of disadvantaged children has been enhanced by Head Start, we must ask why so many people have become critical of the program. The answer, I believe, involves the pendulumlike nature of our thinking about the developing child, as well as the tendency of educational decision makers to board theoretical bandwagons.

The environmental mystique

When Head Start began, the favored theoretical position was what I have termed the "environmental mystique." Essentially, this position held that young children are so malleable that rather minimal interventions in the early years will have major and lasting impact. The theorists whose work gave rise to this mystique were themselves rebelling against an earlier view of child development emphasizing hereditary factors, a maturationally determined sequence of development, a relatively non-malleable child and a fixed IQ. In the mid 1960s, the pendulum had swung to the extreme environmentalist position, and as a result we became immersed in pleas and promises that emphasized the cognitive system's openness to change, and therefore the ease with which intellectual development could be enhanced.

The environmental mystique captured the nation's thinking. We were bombarded with books for laymen, magazine articles and stories in the daily press, all indicating that with the right kind of intervention each and every child would eventually function at an elevated intellectual level. Newspaper stories reported compensatory programs that yielded a point of IQ increase for every month a child spends in the program. (One immediately wonders why all parents would not avail themselves of 30 or 40 months of such treatment for their children.) In one instance, the early and still tentative results of cognitive stimulation of infants by a distinguished group of researchers were reported as though the secret of accelerated cognitive development had been uncovered. Books poured forth informing parents how to give their children superior minds and how to teach them to read at the age of two.

When this environmental bandwagon with all its excesses really got rolling, educators and the producers of educational materials were quick to hop aboard. Professional con-

ventions were inundated with salesmen hawking the latest in educational equipment. This hardware was promoted as being consistent with the "environmental mystique" and at the same time appealed to the very strong attachment to technology that characterizes the American ethos. Some of these educational materials were constructed on the basis of sound psychological and pedagogical theorizing and research, but many of them were pure junk. School administrators were soon pushed into a keeping up with the Joneses. No school could afford to be the last to have that latest piece of equipment that would guarantee educational success.

Parents of young children, inundated with material about how malleable their children's minds were, were quickly seen as a ready market for educational toys. Where once mothers and fathers went to toy stores in the hope of obtaining an object that their child would enjoy, they were now more interested in "toys that teach."

Throughout this period, there were, of course, those persons who had the good sense to insist that almost any toy could teach if the parents took the trouble to use it to arouse the child's curiosity and interest and as an occasion for social interaction between parent and child. Some specialists even had the temerity to state, wisely in my opinion, that the cognitive development of the very young child has less to do with formal learning intervention than with the natural exchange between the child and his environment. If his parent is interacting with him, the young child can learn more by playing with pots and pans than with the expensive toys parents buy in hopes of raising their child's IQ.

Be that as it may, since the environmental mystique represented the dominant position in the theoretical literature, permeated the popular press and became established in the minds of parents, it is easy to see why the preschool programs of the 1960s had such a strong cognitive orientation. If the mind of the child was so plastic, and environmental intervention appeared so promising, it would be criminal not to direct our efforts toward enhancing cognitive development. The fact that, with the exception of a few highly experimental programs that are still in need of considerable assessment, we have almost nowhere produced the degree of cognitive improvement in poor children that we had hoped for has been a most sobering experience. We had clearly overpromised, and the great danger now is that the undue optimism of the '60s may give way to undue pessimism in the '70s.

We can improve cognitive development of children, but for most children this improvement will be more limited than we had thought. Moreover, to achieve and sustain this improved cognitive functioning will require much longer and more intensive efforts than can be provided by an eight-week or even one-year intervention program.

The post-Sputnik reaction

Another element that led to our preoccupation with cognitive aspects of development was the post-Sputnik panic that swept the nation at about the same time that preschool compensatory programs were getting underway. That some nation could be slightly ahead of America in even one realm of technology seemed intolerable, if not to the American people, certainly to our decision makers. The nation clearly needed a fall guy to explain this loss of face, and, as is so often the case, the fall guy turned out to be the American school.

Admirals who had access to the public arena became pedagogical experts overnight. Thus, virtues of Soviet education, with its emphasis on those skills that lead to en-

gineering accomplishments, were contrasted with American schools and their tender-minded, Dewey-eyed concern with personal adjustment. In short order, educators were extolling the virtue of teaching reading, writing and arithmetic and turning away from the view that the school had some responsibility in producing a whole person who could take his place in society. Unfortunately, many educators capitulated to this one-sided view, and in too many places, preschools became rather awesome settings in which the rigors of the elementary schools were simply introduced to children at an earlier age.

The "whole child" approach, with its commitment to the view that a child's emotional and motivational development are just as important as his cognitive development, continues to be suspect. The critics of this approach range from those who consider it tender-minded to those who see in it some pinko plot to undermine the nation. But the criticism does not change the fact that children are much more than cognitive automatons. The child is a whole person whose physical, cognitive and emotional-motivational dimensions interact in a complex fashion. Those who insist on approaching the developing child as some sort of disembodied cognitive system strike me as being simple-minded, not tough-minded.

The "discovery" of cognitive development

Other factors played a role in the overly cognitive evaluation of Head Start and other remedial programs. One such factor was that, 15 or so years ago, American child-development specialists discovered the work of Jean Piaget and his classic efforts in charting cognitive development in children. Here again, the pendulumlike nature of so much of American thought concerning children manifested itself with investigators moving from too little emphasis to too much.

Until the mid 1950s, American behaviorism held sway, and thought was considered by many to be unworthy of investigation. Indeed, it was considered bad form and too subjective even to ask a child why he was doing what he was doing. This uniquely American behavioristic approach caused the cognitive emphasis of such European thinkers as Piaget, Werner and Vygotsky to be almost totally ignored. As behavioristic enthusiasm waned, American researchers decided that thought and cognition were phenomena worthy of investigation, and Piaget in particular was discovered with a vengeance. One must, of course, applaud this belated discovery and be thankful for the contributions that have been made to our understanding of cognitive development by American psychologists such as Jerome Bruner. What I cannot applaud is the fact that cognitive development has now so captured our interest that far too small an effort is being expended in illuminating the nature of emotional and motivational development.

Measurement problems

Head Start's influence on emotional and motivational growth was underestimated for another reason: the difficulty of measuring those factors. With the many standardized tests available, it is easy to see why so many investigators focused on intelligence and cognitive development. There is nothing in the socio-emotional realm akin to standardized IQ measures. What must be emphasized is that this reflects nothing more than the state of refinement of socioemotional theory and measurement and does not indicate that cognitive variables are "more real" than socioemotional variables.

If I am correct in my suspicion that compensatory programs have a larger impact on motivational and emotional factors than on cognitive factors, we will never assess the magnitude of this impact by continuing to

overemphasize cognitive measures in our evaluations of compensatory efforts. Justifying the use of cognitive measures because of their easy availability reminds me of the old joke about the individual who lost a quarter in the middle of the block one night, but decided to look for it up at the corner since the light was better there.

Difficulties of evaluation

Several monographs and more than a hundred papers have now been published evaluating the effectiveness of Head Start and other preschool compensatory education programs. It would be impossible for me to discuss this work here, just as it would be unrealistic for social policy planners to expect this work to generate a simple conclusion. The studies themselves are a conglomerate of evaluations of a wide variety of treatments or programs which produced different outcomes. Indeed we have already reached the point at which conclusions about the studies can be predicted by identifying the theoretical allegiance of the authors.

As one who is deeply involved in both research and social policy, I can appreciate the difficulty in detecting a clear signal in the midst of all this noise. But I do think that on the basis of the evidence, a number of reasonable statements can be made, and at this particular point in time, these statements can be used to help determine our social-action efforts.

What we have learned from the evidence is what we could have predicted at the outset—namely, that intellectual gains discovered at the end of a summer or one-year compensatory program are likely to dissipate unless: (a) parents extend the remedial program to the home through their own efforts; and (b) the preschool program is followed by a further special educational effort once the child reaches elementary school. The social-action implications of these findings are obvious: More direct assistance to parents in child rearing, as in the OGD Home Start program, should be made available; and preschool programs should invariably be followed by school enrichment efforts, such as those authorized by Title I of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act.

However, even if one recognizes that Head Start results in some unquestioned immediate gains and some less clearly identifiable long-term gains, the problem in evaluating the program still exists. We will always have deserving social-welfare programs competing for scarce resources, and we have little way of knowing whether the accomplishment and dollar costs of a program signal its continuation or suggest instead that the money be spent for other social purposes. While some technocrats believe that "scientific" evaluations will lead inexorably to cost-effectiveness data upon which errorless social policy can be built, I believe that it makes more sense to admit honestly that we do not have totally objective means of assessing the dollar value of gains brought about by Head Start.

So when we consider the broad goals of Head Start and realistically examine its real effectiveness against these goals, the program cannot be dismissed as a failure. Neither should this rather fragile effort during one year of a child's life be viewed overoptimistically. It obviously is not the ultimate solution to poverty, illiteracy, underachievement, racism, delinquency and failure in later life. We must respect the complexity and continuity of human development.

The Head Start year in the child's life is important; the first five years are important. So are the next five, and the five after that. Intellectual achievement is important, but so are physical and emotional health and motivation if our goal is to enable the nation's children to take advantage of our efforts to expand the range of opportunities available to them.